DIFFERENCES IN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, SCHOOL AFFILIATION, STUDENT AND TEACHER EFFICACY BELIEFS, PARENTS' PERCEPTIONS, AND TEACHER INSTRUCTION BETWEEN HIGHLY MOBILE STUDENTS PLACED AT STABLE AND TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

By

SANDRA HATCH ANUSAVICE

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1999

For my husband, Ken, who always knew I could do it.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have helped me along the way to this accomplishment. Foremost among this group are the teachers and school administrators who allowed me to be a part of their classrooms for a year. I appreciate their graciousness and assistance. I also thank my friends and colleagues Susan Culbert and Jan Scott from whom I learned so much about exemplary teaching.

I would especially like to thank my committee members - Dr. Robert Wright, Dr. Jin-Wen Hsu, and Dr. James Doud - for their excellent teaching, their faith in me, and their support throughout this process. For my committee chair, Dr. Linda Behar-Horenstein, there are not words to express my gratitude. She has been my mentor, my teacher, and my friend. Because of her guidance, my journey toward the Ph.D. has been a joyous experience, a growth of intellect and understanding that she has shaped and nurtured. A mere 'Thank You' cannot suffice. I hope that my work will be a tribute to her leadership.

Finally, I thank my family who contributed so much to my achievement: my parents, Rudolph and Kitty Hatch, who gave me a love of language and taught me its power; my children, Jill and Joel, who have always encouraged me to 'go for it'; and my wonderful husband, Ken, who has helped me build the bridge between dreams and reality and supported me in all things.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES vii

ABSTRACT x

CHAPTERS

1. INTRODUCTION 1

Background for the Study 3
Statement of the Problems 4
Statement of Hypotheses 5
Definition of Terms 6
Significance of the Study 9
Limitations 10

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 12

Student Mobility 12
    Research on Student Mobility 13
    Impact on Student Achievement 14
    Impact on School Systems 20
Teacher Efficacy 24
    Teacher Efficacy Beliefs and Teacher Behavior 24
    Teacher Efficacy Beliefs and Student Achievement 29
    Teacher Efficacy Beliefs, Management, and Instructional Styles 31
Student Efficacy 32
Instructional Strategies 35
Summary 39

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS 41

The Settings 41
Participants 43

Tasks and Materials 45
Operational Definition of Variables 48
Instrumentation 50
  Curriculum-Based Assessments 50
  Parent Survey 51
  Teachers' Instructional Strategies 53
  School Affiliation 54
Data Collection 54
Data Analysis 55

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 57

Quantitative Analysis 57
  Research Question 1: Academic Achievement, Student Absenteeism, Discipline Referrals 58
  Academic Achievement 58
  Student Absenteeism 59
  Discipline Referrals 62
  Research Question 2: Teacher Efficacy 63
  Research Question 3: Parent Perceptions of Learning Environment 64
  Research Question 4: Student Self-Efficacy 66
Qualitative Analysis 66
  Instructional Models and Learning Environment 67
  Teachers' Instructional Activities 75
  Instructional Activities of Students 78
  Teachers' and Students Instructional Roles 80
  Examples of Instructional Strategies 89
  Research Question 6: Students' Efficacy Beliefs 105
  Teacher Responses to Students 107
  Examples of Teacher Responses 109
  Quality of Teacher Discipline 125
  Examples of Teacher Disciplinary Practices 128
Teacher and Participant Interactions 141
  Teacher-to-Participant Interaction 141
  Participant-to-Teacher Interaction 143
  Participant-to-Peer Interaction 145
  Research Question 7: Students' Sense of School Affiliation 146
Summary 152

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 155
Findings 156
  Student Achievement 156
  Attendance 156

Discipline Referrals 156
Teachers' Efficacy Beliefs 157
Student Beliefs of Academic Efficacy 158
Parent Perceptions of Learning Environment 158
Instructional Strategies..159
Teachers' Instructional Activities and Roles 160
Instructional Supports and Instructional Grouping 162
Teacher Responses to Students 164
Teacher Disciplinary Actions 165
Teacher Interaction with Participants 166
Participant Interaction with Teachers 167
Participant Interaction with Peers...168
Participant Affiliation with School 169
Student Instructional Activities and Roles 170
Conclusions...172
Recommendations 174
Policy Implications 176

REFERENCES...178

APPENDIX A Observation Questions...184

APPENDIX B Student Survey..186

APPENDIX C Teacher Survey..189

APPENDIX D Student Interview Questions...191

APPENDIX E Student Assent Script 193

APPENDIX F Institutional Review Board Approval...195

APPENDIX G Parent Consent Forms..197

APPENDIX H Teacher Consent Form 201

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH...203

LIST OF TABLES

Table page

3.1 Demographic Profile of Home Base and Comparison Site Teachers 45

4.1 Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Participants' ITBS Scores (1996-97) in Reading and Mathematics 59

4.2 Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Adjusted Post-Test Means for Pre- and Post-test in Reading and Mathematics (CBA) 60

4.3. ANCOVA Summary Table for CBA Reading Scores 60

4.4 ANCOVA Summary Table for CBA Mathematics Scores 61

4.5 Means and Standard Deviations of Participants' Absences for the 1997-98 School Year 61

4.6 ANOVA Summary Table for Absences 61

4.7 Means and Standard Deviations for Discipline Referrals of Participants for the 1997-98 School Year by Group 62

4.8 ANOVA Summary Table for Participant Discipline Referrals by Group 63

4.9 Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Participants' Academic Self-Efficacy Survey Responses by Group 66

4.10 Information-Processing Models 69

4.11 Social Models 70

4.12 Personal Models 71

4.13 Behavioral System Models 72

4.14 Percentages of Instructional Models Used (and Number of Observed Uses) by Group 74

4.15 Mean Number of Teaching Models Observed by Teacher Group. 75

4.16 Percentages of Instructional Activities Observed (and Number Observed) for Teachers by Group 77

4.17 Percentages of Participants' Observed Instructional Activities (and Number Observed) by Group. 79

4.18 Percentages of Observed Instructional Roles (and Number of Observed Roles) for Teachers by Group. 81

4.19 Percentages of Students' Instructional Roles (and Number Observed) by Student Group 84

4.20 Percentages of Observed Instructional Organization (and Number Observed) by Group. 85

4.21 Percentages of Observed Leadership of Instructional Groups (and Number Observed) by Group 86

4.22 Percentages of Observed Type and Use of Instructional Supports (and Number Observed) by Group 88

4.23 Percentages of Participants' Observed Academic Self-Efficacy Behaviors (and Number Observed) by Student Group 106

4.24 Percentages of Observed Teacher Responses to Students (and Number Observed) by Group. 108

4.25 Frequency (and Total Number) of Observed Teacher Disciplinary Actions by Group 127

4.26 Frequency (and Total Number) of Observed Teacher Responses to Participants by Group 143

4.27 Percentages of Observed Participant-to-Teacher Interactions (and Number Observed) by Student Group 144

4.28 Percentages of Observed Participant-to-Peer Interactions (and Number Observed) by Student Group 146

4.29 Percentages of Observed School Affiliation Behaviors (and Number Observed) by Student Group....148

4.30 Frequency of School Affiliation Interview Responses (and Number of Students Responding) by Student Group....150

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

DIFFERENCES IN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, SCHOOL AFFILIATION, STUDENT AND TEACHER EFFICACY BELIEFS, PARENTS' PERCEPTIONS, AND TEACHER INSTRUCTION BETWEEN HIGHLY MOBILE STUDENTS PLACED IN STABLE OR TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

By

Sandra Lee Hatch Anusavice

August, 1999

Chairman: Linda S. Behar-Horenstein
Major Department: Educational Leadership

This study explored the difference between highly mobile students who attended Home Base school, a stable educational placement, with similarly transient students in local elementary schools by: (a) academic achievement; (b) discipline referrals; (c) absenteeism; (d) students' academic self-efficacy beliefs; (e) parents' satisfaction with the school; (f) teachers' beliefs about these students' ability to be successful in school; (g) teachers' self-efficacy beliefs about their ability to successfully teach these students; and (h) the type and variety of instructional strategies used by teachers.

The experimental and control student groups were matched demographically across race, gender, grade level, prior academic achievement, number of school moves, and length in residence at the school. Sources of data included classroom observations, participant responses to teacher, student, and parent surveys, interviews with students, pre- and post-test scores on a Curriculum-Based Assessment (CBA) in reading and mathematics, and attendance and disciplinary data for the 1997-98 school year.

No significant differences in mathematics gains between the two groups of students were found. However, the students from Home Base school made significantly greater gains in reading than did the comparison group (p=.04). Participants at Home Base school had fewer discipline referrals and higher absenteeism than those at comparison site schools. Students at Home Base school had a greater sense of academic self-efficacy than did students at the comparison sites (p=.02). Parents at Home Base school felt they were more welcome in their child's classroom (p=.004) and that they had been consulted more frequently for ideas about how to improve the school (p=.024) than did parents of students at the comparison sites. Teachers at the Home Base and comparison site schools reported no difference in both their beliefs about the students' ability to be successful in school and their ability to successfully teach these students. Multiple classroom observations conducted over a seven-month period revealed that Home Base teachers used a wider range of instructional strategies and teaching models, facilitated an engaging learning environment, offered more praise to the students, had more positive interactions with students and took a more active and supportive instructional role than did the comparison site teachers.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

As American society has become increasingly mobile, student achievement, teacher workload, and school success measures have been affected (Lash & Kirkpatrick, 1990). Student mobility is underestimated and perhaps even misunderstood. Teachers' attention to academic problems related to student mobility often seems inadequate, if not inappropriate (Nelson, Simoni, & Adelman, 1996). Estimates of student mobility vary between 17% and 23%; Lash and Kirkpatrick (1990) reported that 23% of children in primary grades relocate each year.

Much of the research on student mobility suggests that the frequency of moves, especially at the primary grades, is associated with lower academic performance and poorer adjustment to school (Alspaugh, 1991; Blane, Pilling, & Fogelman, 1985; Ingersoll, Scamman, & Eckerling, 1989). Of particular concern are those students who move within the school district. Alexander, Entwistle, and Dauber (1996) reported distinct migration patterns based on racial-ethnic background and socioeconomic status (SES). Students moving outside the district were typically more affluent, predominately white, and their parents were more highly educated. Students transferring within the district were more frequently poor and/or minorities and more likely to be living in a single-parent family headed by a high-school dropout. Schools with the highest proportion of low-income families had significantly higher rates of student mobility (Nelson, Simoni, & Adelman, 1996). Some researchers, however, dispute the belief that mobility is a cause of poor academic achievement (Adduci, 1990; Evans, 1996; Paredes, 1993). Whether mobility causes low academic achievement and poor school adjustment or whether it is merely one of several risk factors, few researchers deny that transience, particularly during the early grades, is detrimental to learning.

Teachers most often have the responsibility for integrating new students into the classroom (Lash & Kirkpatrick, 1990). This integration is especially difficult to accomplish when students move outside of normal transition times (Alexander, Entwistle, & Dauber, 1996). In a study of 21 teachers, Lash and Kirkpatrick (1990) found that most teachers reported little or no benefit in working with children who move frequently. The teachers believed that transient students created extra work for them, made classroom management more difficult, and presented instructional problems. They also believed these mobile students had more difficulty in social adjustment and in making friends. Although Title I provides funds for migrant students, few services have been provided for the locally transient populations. Migrant students may actually be less disruptive to schools and teachers than the locally transient students because migrant students move as a group at predictable times during the school year and often return to the same school the following season (Lash & Kirkpatrick, 1990). Of much greater concern is the transient student who moves in and out of school within a district during the school year. These students move individually in response to the turmoil in their lives and may change schools several times within the course of an academic year.

Nelson, Simoni, and Adelman (1996) have suggested that school districts might address the problem of locally transient students by eliminating required changes in school zones when a student moves within the district. A mid-sized county in a southeastern state instituted such changes by establishing a specialized center school for highly mobile students in primary grades. Because such pilot programs are quite new, little research has been conducted. How effective are such centers? To date, their effectiveness remains an area ripe for investigation.

Background for the Study

Participants in this study were selected from a segment of the county school population which was designated as highly mobile. Characteristically, these children changed school zones several times during the academic year. Such transitions disrupt both the learning process and the student's ability to form social links to the school. In January of 1997, the school district established a special center, hereafter referred to as the Home Base School, for students in grades K-2 who met the criteria of "highly mobile" (two or more moves resulting in changes of school zones within the last two years). Parents of students who qualified for the program were able to choose whether to send their children to the Home Base School or the regular school for which they were zoned. One benefit of attending the Home Base School was that the school district agreed to provide transportation for the students to this site regardless of where the family moved within the school district. Thus, the Home Base School provided a stable academic placement for its students. In 1997-98, the Home Base School added a third grade class to accommodate an increasing number of students. At present, the Home Base School has grown to include a fourth and fifth grade class. Other grades may be added in coming years. The purpose of this study emerged partly in response to the school district's interest in determining whether placement at the Home Base School was making a difference in academic achievement and school adjustment among students. Towards that end, the purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences among (a) students' academic achievement, their affiliation with school, and their efficacy beliefs about their ability to be successful in school; (b) teachers' instructional behaviors and their efficacy beliefs about their ability to successfully teach these students; and (c) parents' satisfaction with the learning environment when compared by school sites.

Statement of the Problems

The following questions were developed to guide this investigation.

1. Is there a difference between students at the Home Base School and comparison site schools when compared by (a) academic achievement; (b) rate of absenteeism; and (c) number of disciplinary referrals?

2. Is there a difference between teachers at the Home Base School and comparison site schools in their efficacy beliefs and their perceptions of highly mobile students' ability to be successful in schools or their perceptions of their ability to successfully teach these students?

3. Is there a difference between parents of students at the Home Base School and comparison site schools in their perceptions of the learning environment their children experience?

4. Is there a difference between teachers at the Home Base School and comparison site schools in their use of instructional strategies?

5. Is there a difference between students at the Home Base School and comparison site schools in their beliefs about their ability to be successful in school?

6. Is there a difference between the students at the Home Base School and comparison site schools in their sense of school affiliation?

Statement of Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were proposed:

1. There will be no differences between students at the Home Base School and comparison site schools when compared by (a) academic achievement; (b) rate of absenteeism; and (c) number of disciplinary referrals.

2. There will no difference between teachers at the Home Base School and comparison site schools in their efficacy beliefs and perceptions of highly mobile students' ability to be successful in school and their ability to successfully teach these students.

3. There will be no difference between parents of students at the Home Base School and comparison site schools in their perceptions of the learning environment.

4. There will be no difference between teachers at the Home Base School and comparison site schools in their use of instructional strategies.

5. There will be no difference between students at the Home Base School and comparison site schools in their beliefs about their ability to be successful in school.

6. There will be no difference between students at the Home Base School and comparison site schools in their sense of school affiliation.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are provided to clarify important terms used within this study.

1. Academic gains are the mean changes in reading and mathematics scores as determined by calculating the difference between the beginning of the school year to the end of the school year scores on pre- and post-tests using the reading and mathematics portions of the Curriculum-Based Assessment.

2. Comparison group is a group of second and third grade students enrolled in area elementary schools (Cooke Elementary and Stanton Elementary) who met the requirements for high mobility (two or more changes of school zones within two years) and who had also been in residence at their current school for the spring of 1997.

3. Curriculum-Based Assessment refers to an assessment test developed by University of Florida researchers that is aligned to a school district's curriculum.

4. Discipline referrals are the official referral forms for disciplinary infractions. Records of these forms are maintained by the school and include the student's name, the type of infraction, the date of infraction, and the punishment given.

5. Experimental group refers to the group of second and third grade students who were enrolled at the Home Base School in the spring of 1997. This group (26 total) comprised those students presumed to have a "stable educational placement" beginning in the 1997-98 school year.

6. Grade level is the level to which the student is assigned. Students selected for this study were enrolled in grades 2 and 3.

7. High-risk students are students who bring to school a variety of life conditions which are associated with an increased risk of school failure.

8. Home Base School is a special center where highly mobile students may enroll. As long as students remain within the district, they will be transported to this school, thus eliminating the need to change schools each time the family moves to another school zone.

9. Instructional strategies are the teacher's observable methods of presenting material to students.

10. Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) is a standardized measure of student academic achievement.

11. Learning environment is the perception of school atmosphere or learning milieu experienced by teachers, students, and parents.

12. Length of time in residence refers to the length of time in which the student has been enrolled at his or her current school.

13. Models of teaching (teaching models) are conceptual frameworks that teachers use to plan instruction and encourage specific educational outcomes.

14. Parents' satisfaction with school refers to the parents' self-reported beliefs about their feelings of contentment with the learning environment of their child's school.

15. Prior academic achievement is the academic progress of students, as measured by scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, prior to the beginning of the study.

16. Rate of absenteeism refers to the number of days a student is absent in a given school year.

17. School system is the local school district.

18. Student achievement is the academic achievement of students in reading and mathematics as measured by the reading and mathematics portion of the Curriculum-Based Assessment.

19. Student mobility is the movement of students from school to school within or between school districts.

20. Students' academic self-efficacy is the extent to which students believe they can be successful at academic endeavors.

21. Teacher attitudes about teaching highly mobile students are the beliefs teachers hold about the value and rewards of working with students who change schools frequently.

22. Teacher efficacy is the teacher's self-reported beliefs about his or her ability to effectively teach students.

23. Teachers' beliefs about success potential of highly mobile students refer to the beliefs teachers hold about the ability of highly mobile students to be successful in school. These beliefs are related to the amount of work teachers are willing to invest in highly mobile students.

24. Title I is legislation which provides additional funding for schools with a high percentage of impoverished students as judged by qualification for free and reduced lunch

subsidies. Students are selected for services partially based upon scores in reading and mathematics which fall beneath the 35th percentile on nationally normed measures.

25. Traditional elementary schools are the area schools for which each student is zoned. In this district, these schools typically serve 800-1000 students with a wide range of economic and academic backgrounds.

Significance of the Study

The impact of student mobility on school performance has been difficult to determine, but many studies have indicated that transience is at least a complicating factor in the lives of students already at risk. Theoretically, this study addressed the question of whether or not controlling the mobility factor allowed students otherwise at risk for school failure to realize academic gains. The results may also help identify the type of instructional behaviors that support successful academic outcomes, enhance healthy emotional development, and promote positive social interactions for students who are at risk due to mobility. Practically, this study provided information about the success of the Home Base School in meeting its mission and may help to identify what type of instruction facilitates positive student outcomes. A thorough search of the literature suggests that presently the Home Base School may be the only program of its type in the country. The results provide important data about the impact of a stable educational placement on highly mobile students who are at risk.

This study also addressed questions about whether teachers who choose to work with highly transient students have a greater sense of self-efficacy, employ a wider array of instructional strategies, and hold more positive attitudes about transient students. To what extent, if any, are teacher skills different in the Home Base School compared to traditional elementary schools? If teachers in the Home Base School do have a different skill set and different attitudes and beliefs about teaching highly mobile children, what practical wisdom might accrue? Perhaps some directions can be identified for teacher in-service preparation that will help elementary school teachers become more adept at dealing with the particular problems of locally transient students.

Limitations

The following limitations for this study were noted.

1. The study involved a small number of students; 10 students at the Home Base School and 9 students at the comparison site schools completed the study. However, because the Home Base School was so recently established, only 26 students in second and third grade met the initial requirement for length in residency at the school. Therefore, the sample group represents a significant percentage of the population under investigation. Participants at the Home Base School were randomly selected from the experimental population. Students in the comparison group were matched as closely as possible to the experimental group to provide a stratified sample. All of the locally transient students shared many characteristics. The population from which all the participants were drawn qualified for subsidized lunch (free or reduced lunch prices), most had ITBS reading and mathematics scores below the 50th percentile in reading and/or mathematics, and the majority of students in this group were minorities.

2. The use of student interns and long-term substitutes in district classrooms was another limitation. These workers do not represent "regular" or "normative" classroom

teaching. Many more interns or substitutes were used in the comparison site classrooms than in the Home Base School. Obviously, these teachers are not of the same ilk as the experienced, professional teachers. The greater use of interns and substitute teachers at the comparison site schools may have influenced aspects of the learning environment.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to compare highly mobile second and third grade students who selected a stable placement at the Home Base School with highly mobile students who were attending their zoned schools. The students were compared by (a) academic achievement; (b) rate of absenteeism; (c) number of discipline referrals; (d) students' sense of academic self-efficacy and (e) their sense of school affiliation. The parents of students at the Home Base School were compared with parents of students at their zoned schools on a measure of school satisfaction. The teachers at the Home Base School were compared to teachers at the comparison sites on (a) the types and varieties of instructional strategies used; (b) teachers' attitudes towards working with highly mobile students; and (c) teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs about the ability of highly mobile students to be successful in school. The review of the literature will examine four major issues relevant to this study: (a) student mobility; (b) teacher efficacy; (c) student efficacy; and (d) instructional strategies.

Student Mobility

In this section, following an overview of research on student mobility, its impact on student achievement and its impact on school systems will be discussed.

Research on Student Mobility

The increasing mobility of students in the United States has raised important questions about the effect of mobility on student achievement. Many of the students who are highly mobile move short distances within the local school district and can be designated "locally transient." The following discussion will explore factors that lead to local transience and the impact of mobility on student achievement, on school systems, and on teachers.

Mobility occurs both within and external to a school district. The highly mobile student shares characteristics with both migrant students (Lash & Kirkpatrick, 1990) and homeless students (Stronge, 1993) because of the precarious housing or uncertain employment which often contribute to frequent moves. However, while both migrant and homeless populations have programs in place to assist them, the highly mobile student often does not. For purposes of this study, the student who has changed school zones within the local district two or more times within the last two years of schooling has been designated as "locally transient." However, the mobility for participants in this study ranged from a minimum of two school changes to a maximum of eight school changes within two years. Ten of the participants had changed schools three or more times within the last two years.

Students who move about within a given school district have a very different demographic profile than students who move in and out of school districts (Alexander, Entwistle, & Dauber, 1996). The locally transient student is often disadvantaged by poverty, racial minority, and single-parent or no-parent families. These families are often impacted by sociological factors such as lack of affordable housing, unemployment or underemployment, substance abuse, divorce, and domestic violence (Stronge, 1993). Thus the locally transient student is likely to come to school with a variety of cultural and academic disadvantages that place him or her at risk of failure.

Impact on Student Achievement

Studies of the effect of school mobility on student achievement have yielded confusing and contradictory results. In a study of 10th-grade students, Adduci (1990) reported that mobility had no impact on student achievement. She measured mobility by looking at the number of uninterrupted years in the district, the number of moves, and the distance of the moves. She also considered types of transfers: no transfers, within district transfers, out of district transfers, and transfers into the district from outside the United States. Achievement was measured by averaging the student scores on the writing, mathematics, and reading portions of the state-mandated High School Placement Test (HSPT) while controlling for socioeconomic status (SES), language, and family structure. Of the three variables studied--mobility, family structure, and language spoken in the home--Adduci found only student language to be related to school achievement. Students whose families were non-English speaking scored lower on the measure of academic achievement than students who were native English speakers.

Straits (1987) determined that the detrimental effects of mobility were related to parents' educational level. He suggested that mobility seemed to adversely affect the school achievement of students with less-educated parents. Mobile students with well-educated parents seemed to have support systems outside of the school that ameliorated the possible harmful effects of mobility. Blane, Pilling, and Fogelman (1985) asserted that the effects of mobility could not be separated from other risk factors such as race, socioeconomic status, and parental education level. The authors used multivariate analytical techniques to measure the effect of school mobility on student achievement and behavior. Their results indicated that while the achievement scores for the more mobile students were lower, the differences in performance existed prior to the move and were caused by factors other than mobility.

While acknowledging the validity of the Blane et al. study (1985), Ingersoll, Scamman, and Eckerling (1988) found that mobility was detrimental to student achievement even when socioeconomic factors were controlled. They reported that achievement levels of the more mobile student populations were consistently lower than the achievement levels for more stable students. The impact of mobility on achievement was greatest in the early grades; the higher the grade level in school, the less detrimental mobility seemed to be for student achievement.

Benson, Haycraft, Steyaert, and Weigel (1979) found a negative relationship between mobility and both student achievement and school adjustment. The authors collected data on more than 1,000 sixth-grade students in Larimer County, Colorado. Four major variables were considered: socioeconomic status, mobility, achievement, and adjustment. Mobility was measured by the number of schools each child had attended. Achievement was measured by the percentile ranking on the reading subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test. Adjustment was determined by using the Classroom Behavior Inventory which rated both peer adjustment and general adjustment.

Correlational data indicated that mobility was negatively related to all of the variables. However, the authors cautioned that while mobility was a factor in achievement and adjustment, many other factors may contribute to students' difficulty in school. For example, they found a correlation between mobility and low socioeconomic status which could also impact student achievement. Bolinger and Gilman (1997) also found a significant correlation between student mobility and low test scores in language, although the correlation was not significant between student mobility and the entire battery of achievement test scores.

Reynolds (1991) hypothesized that mobility may be particularly damaging to low-income children already academically at risk. Indeed, mobility is often a consequence of poverty. Reynolds selected 1,539 African-American and Hispanic students from government-funded kindergarten programs and followed them for three years, through the end of their second-grade class. Student readiness attributes were collected at the beginning of the study, and student progress was assessed by test scores and teacher reports at predetermined points during the study. Teachers also reported their perceptions of each student's motivation and the level of parental involvement. Reynolds demonstrated that mobility negatively impacted both reading and mathematics achievement. However, he also cautioned that mobility is only one factor in a complex process. Mobility may actually be an indicator of other unmeasured variables such as family disruptions, economic hardship, or broken marriages which might influence student achievement.

A study conducted by the Cleveland Public Schools (1989) compared the most stable students (those who remained in the same school for a complete school year) with the least stable students (those who moved at least once during the school year). Students were compared on the variables of attendance and tardiness, suspension, withdrawal or dropping out, promotion, and achievement in reading and mathematics as measured by normed and criterion referenced tests. Results indicated that the mobile students tended to be from lower income families, have higher rates of absenteeism and suspensions from school, tended to be retained or drop out of school, and have lower achievement scores in reading and mathematics. Ligon and Paredes (1992) compared four groups of elementary students in Austin, Texas. The students were classified as stable over time, moved during the current year, moved during the previous year, or mobile over time. They found that achievement differed among groups at all grade levels, with the most stable group always having the highest achievement.

In a legislative report to U.S. Representative Mary Kaptur (General Accounting Office, 1994), aides indicated that children from low-income families or inner-city schools had higher mobility rates than suburban, middle-class children. While 17% of all third graders had changed schools frequently (three or more times since first grade), they observed that more than 30% of the children who resided with families that earned less than $10,000 had moved frequently. In contrast, only 8% of children in families earning $50,000 or more per year had changed schools three or more times by third grade (Mehana & Reynolds, 1995). Twenty-five percent of inner city third graders had changed schools frequently, compared to 15% of suburban third graders. Students who qualified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) also had higher rates of mobility, and about 34% of third grade students classified as LEP had changed schools frequently. Among these highly mobile third graders, 41% were below grade level in reading, compared to 26% of stable third grade students. Thirty-three percent of the highly mobile students were below grade level in mathematics, compared to 17% of the stable third graders (General Accounting Office, 1994).

Kerbow (1996) noted that earlier studies of mobility failed to concentrate only on intra-district mobility. Students who move within a district often manifest very different demographic characteristics than students who move outside of a district (Alexander, Entwistle, & Dauber, 1996). Most studies also failed to consider the impact of mobility on student achievement over a period of time. Kerbow hypothesized that mobility had cumulative effects on achievement. That is, the more frequently a student changed schools, the more likely he or she would be to fall behind academically. As he followed students who moved repeatedly during their elementary school years, Kerbow found that generally the mobile students had a lower achievement growth than more stable students and that the gap in achievement widened as students moved more frequently. The highly mobile students fell farther and farther behind their stable counterparts over time. Kerbow, too, was reluctant to attribute low achievement only to mobility but concluded that mobility was a factor which combined with other impediments, such as family structure and socioeconomic level, to interfere with student success. For example, he reported that 75% of the frequent movers were African-American. Seventy-eight percent of highly mobile students qualified for free/reduced lunch subsidies. Although only 22%

of the highly mobile students lived in two-parent families, nearly 25% of them lived with neither parent. Thus, highly mobile students are often disadvantaged by a lack of stable family structure and lower socioeconomic status. These factors also imperil their school performance.

Alexander, Entwistle, and Dauber (1996) observed that frequency of moves was associated with lower test scores and poorer grades. Students who have moved frequently were also at greater risk for being retained a grade. While other factors such as previous academic performance, race/ethnicity, and SES could have greater influence on student achievement than mobility, Alexander et al. concluded that mobility was at least a complicating factor in a child's adjustment to school, particularly in the early grades.

Mehana and Reynolds (1995) examined sixth grade children in the Chicago Public Schools who had participated in Reynold's earlier longitudinal study in 1986. By the sixth grade, 81% of the children in their original study were still enrolled in the Chicago Public Schools. Mehana and Reynolds wanted to determine the frequency of moves among low-income children between first and fifth grade. They also searched for predictors of school mobility and tried to determine the impact of school mobility on achievement if other factors such as family background and previous academic achievement were discounted. They found that income (as determined by subsidized lunch eligibility) and parent education were predictors of mobility. In other words, poorer children whose parents were less educated moved more frequently than other children. Mehana and Reynolds observed that a decline in reading achievement was correlated with mobility. No similar declines were observed for mathematics achievement. They concluded that "poverty [was] a significant predictor of mobility and frequent mobility a significant predictor of lower reading achievement in Grade 6" (p. 15).

Impact on School Systems

Estimates of student mobility vary, but studies generally report that between 17% and 23% of school children in the United States move each year (Ingersoll, Scamman, & Eckerling, 1988; Lash & Kirkpatrick, 1990). Most of these students move within the same school district which makes planning and evaluation very difficult for school administrators. Schools with a large transient population may be unfairly penalized when measuring school improvement (ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, 1991; Ingersoll, Scamman, & Eckerling, 1988; Kerbow, 1996; Mao, Whitsett, & Mellor, 1997).

In his study of Chicago schools, Kerbow (1996) examined the movement histories of sixth grade students during the spring of 1994. Mobility was high; over 36% of the students changed schools at least once within a two-year period. Of greatest interest was the discovery that mobility is largely an internal problem. Eighty-seven percent of the students who moved transferred from one Chicago school to another. In fact, most of the mobility occurred within clusters of schools, similar in SES and racial makeup as well as in achievement rankings, that seemed to exchange students frequently. Mobility within a district is not just a product of factors beyond school control such as family instability and economic hardship. Student mobility rate may also be affected by policies and procedures related to zoning and school transfers within the district.

Mobility not only affects the learning of the transient students but may also impact the instructional strategies, curriculum planning, and the learning of stable students within the school. Lash and Kirkpatrick (1990) observed that the primary responsibility for integrating new students into the school fell to the classroom teacher. Teachers reported they rarely knew in advance when new students would be added to their classes. Student records generally arrived several weeks after the students, so teachers had to rely on informal interviews or testing to determine adequate placement for transfer students. Almost all teachers felt that working with highly transient populations created special problems and extra work for them. Frequently, these problems were related to instruction. Teachers found it necessary to review, re-teach, or backtrack to bring new students up to speed, thus slowing down the progress of other students.

Mao, Whitsett, and Mellor (1997) found that student mobility had a negative effect not only on individual student achievement but also on school and district accountability ratings. Thus, it appears that high mobility rates may harm the learning of other students in the classroom and affect the measures of school success for a school or district. However, another study by Heywood, Thomas, and White (1997) failed to show any correlation between the mobility of students in a classroom and the achievement of stable students within the class.

Kerbow (1996) examined school enrollment across an entire academic year in an attempt to understand how mobility affected classroom instruction. He found that in schools with highly mobile populations, the classroom population was in flux most of the year. Chicago teachers employed in unstable schools reported lower levels of collaboration with peers, less focus on student learning, and less openness to instructional innovation. Seventy-seven percent of teachers reported that they reviewed material due to the addition of new students during the school year. Kerbow demonstrated that this emphasis on review and more routine instruction had the effect of decreasing the instructional pace for all students. Furthermore, a slower pace of curriculum was cumulative; by fourth grade, the curriculum pacing at highly mobile schools lagged almost an entire grade level behind that of less mobile schools. The impact of mobility on student achievement may affect not only the students who transfer but also the instruction offered to the stable students within the system.

School reform movements have failed to consider mobility as a factor in measuring school performance. Efforts at school improvement assume that schools will have a stable cohort of students over time, when in fact, the students who are tested may not be the students who were taught. Kerbow (1996) discovered that after four years, in the more mobile Chicago elementary schools, less than 30% of the student body will have attended since the beginning of first grade. For this reason, program evaluation becomes much less meaningful in highly mobile schools.

Ligon and Paredes (1992) also explored how mobility impacts school programs. Most instructional programs are designed for a student population that remains stable for at least a given school year and ideally for the entire grade span covered by a school. School districts have not devised systems of curriculum or measurements to deal with a segment of the school population which is increasingly transient. Ligon and Paredes suggested that an index of student stability would be useful in evaluating school accountability measures. School progress could be evaluated by looking only at the students who had been in place long enough to have benefited from the instructional programs.

Ligon and Paredes (1992) surveyed state departments of education in all 50 states as well as extra-state jurisdictions, Department of Defense Dependents Schools, and the District of Columbia to determine how student mobility statistics were calculated. The results demonstrated that school districts calculated mobility statistics using available data rather than appropriate data. The methods of calculation differed widely. Ligon and Paredes organized the different mobility formulas they encountered into one of the following four categories: (a) stability indices which describe the proportion of students who are enrolled for the entire school year; (b) turbulence indices which describe the total number of changes/moves by students compared to the total number of students enrolled; (c) mobility indices which describe the proportion of students who move and change school assignment within a school year; and (d) mobility counts which is the actual number of student school changes within a school year. Such variations in the manner of calculating mobility data make national comparisons of mobility rates impossible. Ligon and Paredes suggested that several standardized methods of calculation be introduced, based on the information needed or questions asked. For example, to measure the impact of school programs, an index of student stability could be used. An index of student mobility and a mobility impact index could be used to assess the true mobility rates and indicate how mobility affected individual student achievement. One of the demonstrable difficulties with previous studies is that researchers have used widely varying measures to determine mobility and to select their experimental populations. If researchers are to form a clearer understanding of the link between mobility and learning, some consensus much be reached on how to measure mobility. In addition, mobility must be taken into account when determining school progress and accountability.

While the literature has not established a definite causal link between high mobility and lower academic achievement, studies indicate a correlation between mobility and achievement. Until now, no studies have explored how the absence of mobility could improve student achievement, regardless of socioeconomic and cultural factors. The present study makes an important and unique contribution to the field by examining the effectiveness of a stable school placement for locally transient students.

Teacher Efficacy

Theories about the role of personal efficacy in cognitive functioning have been expanded to include the effects of teacher efficacy on student achievement and teachers' instructional and management behaviors. The following section will examine studies which discuss the relationship between teacher efficacy beliefs and (a) teachers' behavior, (b) student achievement, and (c) teachers' management and instructional styles.

Teacher Efficacy Beliefs and Teacher Behavior

Teacher efficacy measures the teachers' beliefs about the effectiveness of their efforts to improve student achievement (Ross, 1994). According to Ross, the greatest contributions to teacher efficacy theories were based on Rotter's work on locus of control, Weiner's attribution categories, and Bandura's self-efficacy studies. Bandura (1989) theorized that self-reflection enabled people to evaluate and change their own behavior. A part of these self-evaluations included what he termed self-efficacy beliefs, one's beliefs in one's ability to achieve a particular outcome. One's perception of self-efficacy is a mediation between thought and action. As Bandura (1989) claimed, having skills and knowledge does not necessarily guarantee that one can use them successfully in a variety of demanding and unpredictable circumstances. Ashton and Webb (1986) defined teacher efficacy as "teachers' situation-specific expectation that they can help students learn" (p.3). Efficacy beliefs influence activities individuals choose to do as well as the effort, persistence, and resilience they demonstrate when pursuing the task. The higher one's sense of self-efficacy, the more likely one is to choose a task and pursue it with effort, persistence, and perseverance (Pajares, 1996). Teacher efficacy has two dimensions: general teaching efficacy, an individual's belief that teaching can influence student learning; and a sense of personal teaching efficacy, an individual's beliefs in his or her own ability to influence the learning of students in his or her classroom (Ashton & Webb, 1986). Self-efficacy beliefs are correlated with self-concept, attributions, motivation, and academic achievement. Although self-efficacy beliefs are most highly correlated with achievement when the constructs are particular to certain skills, even generalized self-efficacy perceptions are accurate predictors of general academic achievement (Bandura, 1989; Pajares, 1996).

When Bandura's theories are applied to teaching, efficacy beliefs are thought to influence teacher behavior in four distinct processes. A higher sense of efficacy may help teachers set higher goals for themselves and their students, be willing to work harder to achieve those goals and persist despite obstacles or initial lack of success. Teachers with high efficacy beliefs may also be willing to accept a greater responsibility for student achievement rather than attributing student outcomes to factors beyond teacher control. High efficacy beliefs contribute to greater stress-coping mechanisms which help teachers manage day-to-day pressures and achieve greater job satisfaction. Since efficacy beliefs have great influence on choices of activities, teachers with higher efficacy beliefs may demonstrate a greater commitment to teaching (Ross, 1994). Thus the premise of teacher efficacy is that a teacher's beliefs about his or her ability to teach will impact student achievement. A greater sense of efficacy should promote student learning.

Fletcher (1990) demonstrated a link between teachers' efficacy and their perceptions about students' ability to learn. The teachers with higher efficacy beliefs were more likely to view student ability as an incremental trait that can be increased by effective instructional practices. Fletcher also found that teacher efficacy beliefs were influenced by teacher involvement in organizational decisions, the behavior and attitude of students in the school, and the amount of control teachers have over classroom instruction. Ashton and Webb (1986) indicated that teachers' efficacy beliefs are impacted by their assumptions about how capable their students are of learning the material presented. Raudenbush, Rowan, and Cheong (1992) distinguished between teacher efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations. While the two are related, teachers could have high efficacy beliefs and still have lower outcome expectations based on external factors such as home environment or ability level that they perceive to affect student performance.

Classroom characteristics may have an effect on teacher efficacy. Elementary school teachers generally indicated higher efficacy levels than high school or middle school teachers. Within high schools, teacher efficacy tended to increase as grade level increased. However, this correlation was indicated in only one study (Raudenbush, Rowan, & Cheong, 1992), so these findings are limited by a lack of corroboration. Raudenbush et al. also demonstrated that high school teachers' efficacy ratings increased as the ability grouping level of the students improved and as a function of the teacher's sense of preparedness to teach the course. Increasing the number of low achieving students in a class decreased a teacher's sense of efficacy (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983). Although Hoover-Dempsey, Bassler, and Brissie (1992) found no correlation between school SES and teacher efficacy, Bandura (1993) reported that a combination of low SES, high student turnover, and high absenteeism created poor achievement patterns which lessened teachers' efficacy beliefs.

Teachers with high efficacy beliefs are more likely to use a variety of instructional strategies including active learning (Ross, 1994). However, no assumptions about causality are being made here. Researchers cannot determine if a greater sense of efficacy leads teachers to use more demanding instructional techniques or if the mastery of difficult but effective techniques increases a teacher's sense of efficacy. Teachers with higher efficacy scores had a more positive attitude towards implementing new instructional strategies. Teacher efficacy beliefs have also been correlated with a willingness to take responsibility for the learning of special needs students and to meet difficult instructional challenges (Ross, 1994). Teachers with low self-efficacy exhibited a weaker commitment to teaching, spent less time on academic pursuits, and were more likely to become victims of burnout (Bandura, 1993). Hoover-Dempsey et al. (1992)

corroborated earlier findings that indicated higher efficacy teachers reported greater parental involvement in their classroom activities. It is unclear whether higher rates of parental involvement help teachers develop a greater sense of efficacy or if higher efficacy teachers may be more open to and solicitous of parental involvement. The researchers suggested that an interactive relationship exists which allows both parents and teachers to approach working together less defensively.

High-efficacy teachers were more likely to expect academic achievement, use strategies that minimized conflict, and maintain a warm, accepting classroom atmosphere (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983). Furthermore, the students of higher efficacy teachers had higher achievement than students of teachers with low efficacy beliefs (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983; Ross, 1994). Ashton and Webb (1986) also found that teachers' instructional styles were related to their beliefs about general teaching efficacy. High efficacy teachers were more likely to hold students responsible for learning and to foster student initiative by encouraging them to attempt challenging problems and questions. However, teacher efficacy beliefs may not be a stable measure but may vary according to the level of class teachers are assigned, their perceptions of their own preparation to teach the course, the age of the student, and organizational factors with the school (Raudenbush, Rowan, & Cheong, 1992). The study by Raudenbush et al. cautioned against the division of teachers into high and low efficacy categories because efficacy beliefs may change situationally.

Teacher Efficacy Beliefs and Student Achievement

Teacher efficacy has an impact on student achievement. Ross (1992) demonstrated that student achievement was higher in classes led by teachers with high personal efficacy scores than in classes led by teachers with low scores. Raudenbush et al. (1992) showed that teachers with higher efficacy beliefs are more likely to implement demanding but powerful teaching strategies. High efficacy teachers tended to select instructional strategies based on applicability to fostering student development whereas low efficacy teachers tended to select strategies based on their potential to reduce noise and confusion. Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) reported that efficacy was related to classroom management styles. Teachers with higher efficacy ratings preferred student autonomy to custodial control and created warmer, more secure classroom environments (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Higher efficacy teachers tended to have more positive feelings and higher expectations for low achieving students, whereas low efficacy teachers tended to ignore low ability students in favor of high achievers (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983). Dembo and Gibson (1985) reported that high efficacy teachers were more likely to maintain student engagement with instruction over longer periods of time. Higher efficacy teachers also tended to have a stronger academic focus, spend more time in direct instruction, devote more time to large group instruction, and spend more time monitoring student performance (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Low efficacy teachers were more likely to criticize students for wrong answers while high efficacy teachers were more effective in using questioning techniques for leading students to correct responses.

These differences between high and low efficacy teachers might be explained by Bandura's (1989) arguments that people who have low efficacy beliefs tend to lack faith in their coping mechanisms and view their environment as potentially threatening.

Ashton and Webb (1986) reported that high efficacy and low efficacy teachers differed particularly in their treatment of low-achieving students. These differences might be caused by low achieving students having a more extrinsic motivation or lacking academic confidence and therefore being more susceptible to teacher beliefs about their ability (Midgley, Feldlaufer, & Eccles, 1989). Low efficacy teachers might also be more likely to tell low-achieving students about their limited expectations of student achievement. Teacher efficacy may have a greater impact on low-achieving students than on high achievers because lower ability students may be more influenced by teacher expectations and because student failure often spurs high efficacy teachers to greater effort (Midgley, Feldlaufer, & Eccles, 1989; Ross, 1994).

Ashton and Webb (1986) found that the impact of teacher efficacy on student achievement may be subject-matter specific. Their study indicated a higher correlation between teacher efficacy rating and student achievement in mathematics than in communications. However, teachers' efficacy beliefs were predictive of student achievement in both mathematics and language, with higher efficacy teachers producing greater student achievement. Raudenbush et al. (1992) also found teacher efficacy to be dependent on subject matter taught. Ross (1992) found that a sense of personal teaching efficacy had greater impact on student achievement than a sense of general teaching efficacy. Midgley et al. (1989) reported that students' attitudes about their mathematics efficacy was impacted positively or negatively over two years, based on whether they had a high efficacy or low efficacy teacher. Students with low efficacy teachers became more negative in their perceptions of their own mathematical efficacy and perceived mathematics to be more difficult as the years progressed, while students with high efficacy teachers became more confident in their ability to do well and perceived mathematics to become less difficult over time. Midgley et al. (1989) suggested that the impact of teacher efficacy on student achievement is subtle and pervasive over time. Anderson, Greene, and Loewen (1988) found that teachers generally have a higher sense of personal efficacy and a lower sense of the efficacy of teachers in general to influence educational outcomes.

Teacher Efficacy Beliefs, Management, and Instructional Styles

Teacher efficacy is related to classroom management styles, organizational beliefs, convictions about the nature of ability, and general educational philosophy. Identifying high efficacy and low efficacy teachers is not a simple process, nor is definition of high or low efficacy standardized across research studies (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). However, many studies suggest that teacher efficacy may have a significant impact on student efficacy and on student achievement (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983; Ashton & Webb, 1986; Dembo & Gibson, 1985; Fletcher, 1990; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Midgley, Feldlaufer, & Eccles, 1989; Ross, 1992; Ross, 1994; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990)..

Often teachers expect highly mobile students to do poorly. Two studies (Newman, 1988; Sewell, Rodriguez, Chandler-Goddard, & Angelettie-Wallace, 1982) indicated that students who entered the classroom mid-year faced a negative prejudgment by teachers. Teachers expected lower academic performance, poorer attendance, and a more negative attitude from these students. Lash and Kirkpatrick (1990) found that students who entered school after the beginning of the school year were less likely to remain until the end of the year.

The locally transient student does not move in groups at predictable times as migrant students do, but rather in individualistic patterns. Teachers find this individualistic mobility pattern to be the most disruptive. Teachers in urban schools where individualistic mobility is the norm reported the least benefit from and satisfaction in working with highly mobile students (Lash & Kirkpatrick, 1990). Successful adaptation into a new school requires a student to find acceptance among new peers, conform to the academic and behavioral standards, and be accepted by the teacher as a class member (Newman, 1988). If teachers have negative attitudes about working with mobile children and low efficacy beliefs about their ability to teach these students, the likelihood of a child adjusting well to a classroom is diminished.

Student Efficacy

Student efficacy is thought to be a predictor of academic success. In the following section, a review of studies that have explored the relationship between student efficacy and student achievement and studies that have tried to determine ways to build positive efficacy beliefs for students is presented.

"Agency" describes one's conviction in one's ability to manage behavior, understand events, and exercise personal control and competence. Weiner (1976) theorized that agency could be viewed as external, related to causes outside one's control, or internal, related to causes within one's power. At-risk students more often exhibit an external locus of agency, blaming factors outside their control for their failures (Higgs, 1995). Weiner (1976) suggested that how students attribute the cause of their successes and failures may be a more accurate predictor of success and failure than ability. Efficacy beliefs are defined as the expectation that one can perform to a certain level of accomplishment. Outcome beliefs are the predictions of the results of one's performance. Perceived control, efficacy, and outcome expectations are all related constructs, but the present study attended to students' self-efficacy beliefs as they related to academic performance.

Student achievement has been correlated with students' efficacy beliefs about their ability to do well in school (Anderson, Greene, & Loewen, 1988; Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996). Furthermore, teachers' efficacy beliefs were correlated with students' efficacy beliefs, suggesting that teachers who believe they can help students learn foster students' confidence in their own abilities. Researchers have not been able to determine whether the efficacy beliefs cause high achievement, result from high achievement, or if achievement and belief reinforce each other. Certainly students cannot succeed simply by being overconfident in skills they do not possess. However, high self-efficacy beliefs in academic pursuits can give children an advantage in selecting challenging goals and motivating them to persevere when difficulties arise as well as impacting their performance (Ames, 1999; Bandura, 1993; Pajares, 1996). At the same time, performance impacts self-efficacy beliefs, so that students who progress toward their learning goals also build their sense of efficacy (Bandura, 1993; Schunk, 1989). Students' beliefs about their ability to master academic challenges predict their academic achievement; positive efficacy beliefs increase motivation and improve achievement (Bandura, 1993; Schunk, 1991).

Ames (1999) reported that "young children tend to have an optimistic view of their ability, high expectations for success, and a sort of resilience after failure" (p. 138). Older children tend to allow other people's perceptions of their ability to help shape their perceptions of their efficacy. Schunk (1989) claimed that positive teacher feedback can raise students' sense of efficacy. Teachers who provide effective learning strategies and persuade students that they have the ability to use the strategies effectively promote learning (Paris & Byrne, 1986; Schunk, 1991). Learning environments that characterize ability as an acquirable rather than inherent quality, emphasize cooperation rather than competition, and help students assess their own progress over time rather than comparing them to others all help build a greater sense of student self-efficacy and encourage academic achievement (Bandura, 1993).

Schunk (1981) found that self-efficacy beliefs were predictive of arithmetic performance in elementary school children. Furthermore, efficacy beliefs could be enhanced through providing problem-solving techniques, corrective feedback, and opportunities for self-corrective feedback. Ames (1999) and Schunk (1989) both cautioned that children make a shift from connecting effort to success to attributing success to ability. Students who lack a strong sense of academic self-efficacy demonstrate achievement anxiety which is often exacerbated by failure (Bandura, 1993). Thus, success tends to breed success while failure breeds failure. However, Schunk

(1981) has shown that "effort attributional feedback," or telling students that they possess the ability to do a task if they persist and work hard, can improve efficacy beliefs, particularly in young children. In addition, Schunk and Cox (1986) demonstrated that teaching students certain strategies such as "continuous verbalization" (talking their way through the steps to solve a problem) promoted achievement and increased self-efficacy perceptions. Rewards also impact students' efficacy beliefs. Performance-based awards, reflecting progress toward a goal, are more effective in building efficacy than participation-based awards (Schunk, 1989).

Student self-efficacy is an important component of academic achievement. Studies have indicated that perceived self-efficacy can predict students' academic performance. Furthermore, students' self-efficacy is altered by the efficacy beliefs of their teachers, the kind of feedback they are given, and the learning strategies they are taught.

Instructional Strategies

The purpose of teaching is not only to help students master a body of knowledge but to help them become more masterful learners. As students progress in school, the instructional strategies teachers use should enable students to approach future learning tasks more successfully and more independently (Joyce & Weil, 1996). Effective teachers create a variety of learning environments in which children can acquire content and develop successful study methods. Joyce and Weil (1996) have studied these learning environments and have classified one aspect of instructional strategies, models of teaching, into four major groups that share certain characteristics. The groups are identified as (a) the social family; (b) the information-processing family; (c) the personal family; and (d) the behavioral family. No one model of teaching is suitable for every lesson; instead, effective teachers will use a variety of instructional models to achieve their academic purposes (Joyce & Weil, 1996; Joyce, Weil, & Wald, 1981).

The selection of an instructional strategy (model of teaching or teaching model) helps determine teacher behavior which orders the classroom. Once an instructional strategy has been selected, the teacher will establish the tasks to be performed, set up a social system or climate of acceptable behavior within the classroom, and regulate the pace and diversity of instructional challenges students will face (Joyce, 1981). Thus, one might hypothesize that the variety of instructional strategies used by a teacher will reflect the intellectual richness of a classroom environment. Teachers who use a wide variety of instructional models offer more opportunities for students to expand their own learning strategies. Students, particularly those who might be classified as at-risk, are often resistant to instructional strategies that require them to behave in new ways. Joyce and Weil (1996) recommended that teachers create a "dynamic disequilibrium" which will expose students to new ways of thinking and learning that may be temporarily uncomfortable but which can result in greater intellectual growth. With adequate support, these students can re-learn their adaptations to the educational environment and acquire more effective learning strategies.

Three assumptions underlie exploration of diverse instructional strategies. First, teachers can choose from a wide variety of alternative approaches to instruction if they are skilled in using different models of teaching. Second, the instructional method chosen not only influences what is learned, it also influences how it is learned. Finally, students are an integral part of the learning experience, and they react differently to each teaching method (Joyce & Calhoun, 1996).

The use of powerful instructional models has been shown to counteract the negative effects of race, gender, and socioeconomic status (SES) in the classroom. Sharan and Shachar (1988) used a group investigation model with high and low SES students. A control group of high and low SES students were taught using traditional whole group instruction. The low SES students taught by group investigation made twice the academic gains of low SES students taught in the traditional way and even exceeded the gains made by high SES students in the control group. High SES students taught by group investigation greatly exceeded the gains of high SES students in the control group, as well. Group investigation proved to be a powerful instructional strategy for both socially advantaged and disadvantaged students.

In another study, writing teachers used an inductive teaching model with fourth grade students (Joyce, Calhoun, Carran, Simser, Rust, & Halliburton, 1996). They helped students explore techniques used by published authors as a learning tool for improving writing. The teachers collected writing samples from students at intervals and the samples were graded by a panel of experts who did not know the students. The end-of-year writing scores were higher for the fourth graders taught with the inductive thinking model than end-of-year scores for the eighth graders the previous year. All students, from the poorest writers to the best writers, made substantial gains over the year. In addition, the gap between male and female performance narrowed significantly.

One poorly performing middle school had a promotion rate of only 30% and low academic gain scores (Joyce, Murphy, Showers, & Murphy, 1989). Attempts to improve school performance, such as smaller classes, increased counseling, and special programs for at-risk students, had not produced any significant improvement. The researchers trained the faculty in using new models of teaching such as group investigation and inductive thinking. When these strategies were implemented in the classroom, dramatic improvement followed. By the end of the first year, the promotion rate was up to 70%; at the end of the second year, it was 95%. The researchers believed that increasing the instructional repertoire of teachers not only increased learning for students but also reduced off-task behavior and improved school climate.

In a review of research on good teaching, Porter and Brophy (1988) reported that effective teachers offer balanced and integrated learning opportunities which are tailored to fit the needs of their students. Teachers who help students learn metacognitive strategies and provide reinforcement of those strategies through frequent practice enhance student achievement. Brophy and Good (1986) also examined a number of studies that related teacher behavior to student achievement. They found that student achievement was improved when teachers provided context and structure for the information presented. The studies they reviewed also suggested that low SES students require a warmer, more accepting classroom climate, more active learning, and smaller increments of instruction with higher success rates.

The ideal learning environment encourages depth of understanding, encourages excitement about learning, and promotes social as well as cognitive growth. Schools with a positive learning environment demonstrated more time spent on instructional activities, an emphasis on teamwork rather than individual competition, high expectations for student achievement, and more effective patterns of behavior reinforcement (Kohn, 1996).

Using a variety of instructional strategies can improve student achievement by providing students with metacognitive skills which enable them to become independent learners. Student efficacy beliefs can be enhanced by helping students learn new strategies for acquiring knowledge. Furthermore, the conditions which lead to a variety of instructional strategies can be linked to teacher efficacy beliefs and to school climate. All of these factors--efficacy beliefs, instructional practices, and learning environment--are interrelated and have an impact on student achievement.

Summary

Most researchers agree that student mobility is a detrimental factor in student achievement, even though many other disadvantages may exist in the lives of highly mobile students. The research also supports the belief that teachers with high personal efficacy who use a repertoire of powerful instructional strategies can help students overcome the otherwise limiting factors of race, gender, and SES. Student efficacy beliefs are often influenced by the expectations of their teachers; in turn, student efficacy and school climate can also influence student achievement. The Home Base School was formed to meet the needs of locally transient students who come to school with a variety of other disadvantages. The teachers for the school were recruited to work with a population of high-risk students. This study investigated whether the efforts to provide a stable school placement and recruit teachers who desire to work with this population of students led to improvement in students' academic achievement. The study also explored qualitative factors such as teacher efficacy, instructional strategies, student efficacy, and the learning environment in some area elementary schools as compared to the Home Base School. This study investigated whether the Home Base School offered a significantly improved educational opportunity for this group of highly mobile students.

CHAPTER 3
MATERIALS AND METHODS

In an effort to fully describe the methods and procedures used in this study, this section begins with a discussion of the settings where the study was conducted. A discussion of the participants, tasks and materials, variables, instrumentation, and data collection procedures is presented. This chapter concludes with a discussion of the data analysis. All names of schools, centers, teachers, and students have been changed to protect the anonymity of those who participated in the study.

The Settings

On January 27, 1997, the Home Base School opened in a mid-sized southeastern city. The school was designed to offer a stable school setting to students considered at risk of academic failure due to high mobility. Several conditions govern student admission to the school. First, only students in grades K-4 who changed schools at least twice within the last two years were eligible for enrollment. Second, the parents of eligible children must agree to their child's placement at the Home Base School; enrollment is voluntary. Third, once the child is enrolled, the school district agrees to provide transportation for the student to the Home Base School regardless of where the family moves within the school district. Thus, even if a family moves frequently between school zones, their children will not need to transfer to a new school site with each move.

The Home Base School is a small organization that operates under the auspices and administration of the nearby Josephine Baker Elementary School and the local school district administration. When this study was conducted, fewer than 100 students were enrolled at the Home Base School. A Baker teacher on special assignment provides on-site supervision and serves as the Director of the school. The Home Base School is housed on the campus of Sylvia McLeod Center, which is a school for special-needs students. Four regular classroom teachers are employed at the Home Base School. Teachers at the Home Base School have been recruited specifically to work with a high-risk population of students who have multiple disadvantaging factors. At the time this study was undertaken, the student body at Home Base was 84% minority. All of the students were below grade level academically and qualified for lunch subsidies (free or reduced-price lunch), which was used as an indicator of low socioeconomic status (SES).

When the Home Base School first opened, it housed only grades K-2. By the 1997-98 school year, the school had grown to include classes through fourth grade. Currently, the school administrators would like to add grade levels each year until they can offer K-8 education for transient students. During the time of the study, all of the classrooms were multi-age groupings: K-1; 1-2; 2-3; 3-4.

Two comparison site schools with high student mobility were chosen, Cooke Elementary and Stanton Elementary. All three schools (both comparison sites and the Home Base School) used varieties of scripted curriculum for mathematics and reading.

The mathematics curriculum was the same at all three sites; the Home Base School and one comparison site used an identical reading curriculum while the other comparison site used a scripted reading curriculum from a different publisher. Both comparison site schools rotated students among several different teachers for core subjects. The Home Base School generally kept students in self-contained classrooms except to accommodate the needs of individual students.

Participants

Participants who completed the study include 10 students (6 males, 4 females; 5 African-American, 3 White, 2 bi-racial; 8 second graders, 2 third graders) from the Home Base School and 9 students (4 males, 5 females; 6 African-American, 3 White; 5 second graders, 4 third graders) from two comparison elementary schools who were identified as highly mobile. The Home Base experimental participants (12 experimental students and 6 alternates) were randomly selected from the 26 students in second and third grade who had attended the Home Base School in the spring of 1997 and thus could be considered to have a stable educational placement for the 1997-98 school year. Of the 18 students from Home Base School who were invited to be a part of the study, 14 returned consent forms indicating their willingness to participate. Twelve students were selected as participants. The two alternates were used in the pilot study to test the reliability of the survey instrument. Two students from the Home Base School were lost during the year because their families moved out of the school district. A stratified sample of participants from the comparison site schools was selected from the identified group of highly mobile students according to the following criteria: (a) number of school changes within the last two years; (b) length in residence at the current school; (c) grade level; (d) race; (e) gender; (f) SES, and (g) prior academic achievement. Of the 18 students from comparison site schools invited to participate in the study, 9 returned consent forms. All of the comparison site participants completed the study.

The teacher participants at the Home Base School (n=4) included one teacher with a bachelor's degree and two teachers with Ph.D. degrees. The fourth teacher held a temporary position for approximately one month and did not complete the demographic information. All of the teachers at the Home Base School were white. Three of the Home Base teachers were female and one was male. One teacher had less than 5 years teaching experience, one had between 6 and 10 years of teaching experience, and one had more than 20 years of experience. Teachers at the comparison sites (n=11) included four teachers with bachelors' degrees and five teachers with masters' degrees. Two teachers declined to provide demographic information. The teachers who did provide demographic information were evenly distributed along the continuum of teaching experience. Two teachers had less than 5 years experience, one teacher had 6-10 years of experience, two teachers had 11-15 years of experience, two teachers had 16-20 years of experience, and two teachers had more than 20 years of teaching experience. Two of the comparison site teachers were African-American; nine were white. All of the comparison site teachers were female. Table 3.1 shows the demographic profile of the Home Base and comparison site school teachers.

Table 3.1. Demographic Profile of Home Base and Comparison Site Teachers

	n[a]	Education			Race		Gender		Years Teaching Experience				
		BA	MA	PhD	W	B	M	F	<5	6-10	11-15	16-20	>20
Home Base[b]	4	1		2	4	0	1	3	1	1			1
Comparison Site[c]	11	4	5		9	2		11	2	1	2	2	2

[a] Total number of teachers observed at each site
[b] One of the Home Base teachers did not provide demographic information
[c] Two of the comparison site teachers did not provide demographic information

Tasks and Materials

At the beginning of the study, all participants were interviewed to determine a sense of school affiliation. Each participant completed a survey to measure their sense of academic self-efficacy. The interviews and surveys were administered to each student individually by the researcher. From October, 1997, until April, 1998, each student was observed for 30-40 minutes during an instructional period. Seven observations per student were conducted. Field notes were collected to document the interactions of the student with the teacher and his/her peers, the instructional methods being used, and the ways in which the teachers attempted to facilitate student comprehension.

The teacher's instructional style was noted using researcher-developed questions which were based on the instructional frameworks discussed by Joyce and Weil (1996) in their book *Models of Teaching*. The researcher developed the following template of questions (see Appendix A) to describe teachers' instructional styles and serve as a guide for the observations.

1. Sequentially describe the tasks that students are asked to do.
2. Describe student and teacher roles and their respective involvement in the lesson.
3. Describe the teacher's response to students' questions and answers.
4. Identify and describe how instructional supports are used throughout the lesson.
5. Diagram the placement of students being observed.
6. Describe their social interaction with the teacher and their peers.

The survey instruments to measure both student efficacy (see Appendix B) and teacher efficacy (see Appendix C) were adapted by the researcher from suggestions provided by Dr. Albert Bandura (personal communication to Behar-Horenstein, August 1997). The researcher-designed instruments were pilot tested on sample populations of teachers and students. Students at the Home Base School who were selected as alternates for the study (n=2) were given the survey and interviewed by the researcher. Using Cronbach's alpha, reliability for the student survey was estimated at $\alpha=.68$.

Six teachers who were not involved in the study but who also taught highly mobile students volunteered to complete surveys for a pilot test of the teacher survey instrument (Home Base teachers [n=1]; comparison site teachers [n=3]; and alternate site teachers [n=2]). Using Cronbach's alpha, the reliability estimates for the teacher survey was

α=.37. Teachers (n=15) whose students were involved in the study were given the survey (see Appendix C) to determine their attitudes and feelings of efficacy towards working with highly mobile students. Two teachers at the comparison site schools and one teacher at the Home Base School did not return the survey. In total, 12 teacher surveys were analyzed.

Parents of all students involved in the study (n=19) were surveyed to determine their satisfaction with their child's school. The survey instrument was taken from material provided by the Florida Successful Schools Project. Information on how to obtain the survey instrument is provided on page 65. The reader can also review Chapter 1: Successful schools: Pilot project report (Florida Department of Education, 1993-94) for additional information. Two parents declined to complete the survey, although they did give permission for their children to participate in the study. Two parent surveys were not returned. In total, 15 parent surveys were analyzed.

The Curriculum-Based Assessment (Mercer, Jordan, Miller, Schenck, Black, Bock, & Kidwell, 1996) was administered as a pre- and post-test in reading and mathematics to measure academic gains. Sample reading and mathematics tests can be obtained from the technical manual for the Curriculum-Based Assessment. The pre-test was given in the fall of 1997, and the post-test was given in the spring of 1998. Attendance and disciplinary referral data was collected from each school.

Operational Definition of Variables

To qualify for placement at the Home Base School, a child must have moved to different school zones at least twice within the last two years. The participants in this study were comprised by a random sample of students in grades 2 and 3 who attended the Home Base School during the spring of 1997 and returned to the school for the 1997-98 school year. These students were assumed to have a stable placement for the 1997-98 school year. The comparison group was selected among students still in their zoned schools who met the criteria of high mobility, length of time in residence at the school, and grade level. Other moderating variables were matched as closely as possible, given the limited number of students available within the comparison population. Length of time in residence was determined by ranges of time based on enrollment for the 1996-97 school year: more than 17 weeks; 12-17 weeks; 8-11 weeks; less than 8 weeks. Socioeconomic status was determined by qualification for free or reduced lunch subsidies. Prior academic achievement was determined by the reading and mathematics subtest scores of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) based on the Spring 1997 test administration.

Academic gains for the 1997-98 school year were measured using a pre- and post-test of the reading and mathematics portions of the Curriculum-Based Assessment test (Mercer et al., 1996). Frequency of absenteeism was determined by the school-reported attendance records for each participant. Discipline referral information was based on data reported by the schools. School affiliation and academic self-efficacy were determined from a survey based on Bandura's self-efficacy studies (see Appendix B) and an interview conducted by the researcher with each participant (see Appendix D). School affiliation and academic self-efficacy were also assessed qualitatively through classroom observations of the participants. Parent attitudes about school climate were measured by parent responses to The Successful Schools Parent Survey. Instructional methods used by teachers were assessed by observation and classification using the instructional models described in *Models of Teaching* (Joyce & Weil, 1996) and adapted by Behar-Horenstein and Ganet-Sigel (in press). The teacher attitudes about working with highly mobile children were assessed using a survey designed by the researcher based on Bandura's self-efficacy studies (see Appendix C).

The independent variables in this study were (a) placement at the Home Base School; (b) the variety of instructional methods used by the teachers; and (c) teacher attitudes about working with at-risk students.

The moderator variables were (a) length of time in residence at the school; (b) number of school changes within the last two years; (c) grade level; (d) gender; (e) race/ethnicity; (f) socioeconomic status; and (g) prior academic achievement.

The dependent variables measured in this study consisted of determining if there were differences between the experimental group and the comparison group by (a) academic achievement in reading and mathematics; (b) students' sense of school affiliation; (c) students' self-reports of academic efficacy; (d) rate of absenteeism; and (e) the number of discipline referrals.

The researcher conducted classroom observations of teachers and students on a daily basis over a seven-month period to obtain qualitative data about the instructional strategies teachers used and the learning environment. This procedure minimized the obtrusiveness of the study.

Instrumentation

Curriculum-Based Assessments

The Curriculum-Based Assessment (CBA) was devised by university professors and special education coordinators to provide an equitable assessment for all students within the school system (Mercer et al., 1996). The reading and mathematics portions of the assessment were used as a pre- and post-test to measure academic progress during the 1997-98 school year. The information on reliability and validity reported below was taken from the assessment test manual. The curriculum-based assessments were pilot tested in 1994-1995. The standards were normed on tests administered during 1995-1996. Matched to the curriculum of the local school district, the curriculum-based assessment established norm-referenced standards based on the local population of elementary school students.

Oral fluency was used as a valid measure of reading achievement. The CBA measures in oral fluency report the total number of words read in one minute and the total number of words read correctly. Students were given three reading passages from basal reading series to read aloud, representing reading selections from the beginning, middle, and end of the school year. The reading passages were selected by grade level. The students were given one minute per passage to read aloud. The composite reading score represented an average of the total correct words on each passage. A summary of validity studies in the curriculum-based reading assessment indicated correlations ranging from .73

to .90 on most general standardized measures of reading and correlations ranging between .70 and .91 on most tests that measured reading comprehension. Overall, 74% of the standardized reading measures that were reported had a correlations of .70 or higher; 26% of the standardized tests had correlations ranging from .46 to .69.

Mathematics achievement was measured by counting the total number of correct problems solved during the 45-minute testing period. The number and type of problems varied by grade level. The manual noted that the research on validity of the mathematics portion of the CBA had not yielded the same high correlations as reading. A summary of validity studies which correlated the CBA mathematics test with well-known standardized tests indicated that 38% of these tests had a .50 correlation or above with the CBA. Sixty-two percent of these standardized measures had correlations up to .49. The difference in validity between the reading and mathematics measures may be caused by an inaccurate reflection of the mathematics curriculum or the reading requirements within the test may result in penalizing poor readers.

The reliability estimates for the CBA in reading ranged from .89 to .99. In the mathematics portion, 88% of the measures indicated reliability estimates of .70 or higher. Testing directions and tests are available in the technical manual for the Curriculum-Based Assessment.

Parent Survey

The Successful Schools Parent Survey was developed in 1993-94 by the Florida Successful Schools Project. Survey questions were adapted from a survey used by the San Diego County Office of Education. The parent survey was designed primarily to measure the Home-School-Community Relations correlate of effective school attributes. The survey was pilot tested in 16 schools across six Florida school districts representing rural, urban, and suburban districts throughout the state from the Panhandle to South Florida. The participants in the pilot test were selected from schools that qualified for Title I funding (35% or more of the student body were on free or reduced lunch subsidies). The student body at these schools was characteristically comprised by high ratios of minority students, high numbers of Limited English Proficiency students, and/or large numbers of migrant students. Reliability studies and predictive validity estimates were based on data from the four highest achieving and four lowest achieving pilot schools. The reliability of the parent survey was based on the internal consistency of items or groups of items referring to related concepts of effective schools. Predictive validity was determined by correlating survey responses among high and low achieving schools and by correlating survey responses with student achievement at the pilot schools. Using Cronbach's alpha, reliability for the parent survey was estimated at $\alpha=.92$. The predictive validity of the parent survey was insufficient to distinguish between high achieving and low achieving schools except for the items relating to a Safe and Orderly Environment. Parents of students at low-achieving schools were much more likely to indicate a need for stronger discipline policies, improved student behavior, and safer facilities than were parents at high-achieving schools. The survey was designed to provide an assessment of parents' perceptions of school climate and satisfaction with the school, however. While low and high achieving schools could not be predicted on the basis of the survey, the questions did reveal adequate information about school satisfaction.

Teachers' Instructional Strategies

The questions for classroom observations were developed by the researcher based on Joyce and Weil's instructional models framework (Joyce & Weil, 1996). Questions about how instruction is implemented formed the basis for observation within the classroom (see Appendix A). Multiple observations were conducted in each classroom. The dimensions along which observations were conducted included:

1. What are the sequential tasks students are asked to do? (Syntax)
2. What are the student and teacher roles and their respective involvement in the lesson? (Social systems)
3. What are the teacher's responses to students' questions and answers? (Principles of reaction)
4. What instructional supports are being used and how are they used? (Support system)
5. What is the social interaction between the teacher, the student under observation, and his or her peers? (Social interaction)

Each lesson was analyzed inductively, guided by Spradley's (1980) scheme of domain analysis and by the constant-comparative method proposed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Domain analysis worksheets were used to determine the variety of instructional strategies used.

School Affiliation

Students were interviewed individually by the researcher about issues related to school affiliation (see Appendix D). The interviews were transcribed and examined using content analysis to uncover themes related to school affiliation such as liking school, feeling that one's teacher wanted him or her to do well in school, having a sense of the purpose of schooling, and feeling accepted at school. The results of content analysis were grouped into themes and compared qualitatively between students at the Home Base School and students at the comparison sites. Student responses to each theme were tallied and compared by group.

Data Collection

Students in both the experimental and comparison groups were observed for a 30-40 minute instructional period from October 1997 through April 1998. A total of seven observations (approximately one every three weeks) was completed for each student. Field notes were recorded to document the interactions between the teacher and the student under observation, the peer interactions and behavior of the student, and the instructional models used by teachers.

Student, parent, and teacher surveys and student interviews were conducted during the first four weeks of the study. The data from these surveys and interviews were coded and analyzed. Student survey data were used to measure students' sense of academic self-efficacy. Student interview information was used to measure school affiliation. Teacher survey data were used to measure teacher efficacy and beliefs about working with highly mobile students. Parent survey data were used to determine parental satisfaction with the school.

Test data from the pre- and post-test administration of the Curriculum-Based Assessment (Mercer et al., 1996) were used to determine academic achievement in reading and mathematics for the 1997-98 school year. Attendance records and discipline referral records for the 1997-98 school year were obtained from the local schools.

Data Analysis

Two-tailed t-tests were used to test the null hypotheses. The level of significance for each statistical test was set at $\alpha=.05$.

A stable placement at the Home Base School compared to placement in a local elementary school was the primary independent variable. Parents' perceptions of school climate, teachers' and students' perceptions of efficacy, and students' academic achievement--all measured variables--were interval in nature. Attendance rates and number of discipline referrals were also interval in measurement. Prior academic achievement was measured by using the reading and mathematics subtest scores for each participant from the 1996-97 Iowa Test of Basic Skills. These measures were continuous in nature.

A t-test comparing mean scores for the experimental group and the comparison group on the 1996-97 Iowa Test of Basic Skills was used to measure prior academic achievement. Discipline referral data and absences were analyzed using a t-test to compare mean scores of each group. Student academic efficacy was measured by using a t-test to compare group means.

A t-test was performed on the teacher survey results to measure teacher efficacy and beliefs about working with highly mobile children. A chi-square analysis was performed on parent survey data to measure school satisfaction/perception of school climate.

Pre- and post-test data from the Curriculum-Based Assessment were analyzed using ANCOVA. The adjusted means for reading achievement and mathematics achievement between the two groups were compared.

Classroom observations were recorded using continuous observation techniques guided by the questions developed by the researcher from Joyce and Weil's (1996) instructional frameworks. The observations were analyzed inductively as described earlier. Student school affiliation was also analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively using the students' responses to interviews, the student survey, and classroom observation. Reliability was corroborated and validity was assured through a dependability audit in which another trained graduate student reviewed the domains and coded selected samples of the observations.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data collected in this study were analyzed using quantitative and qualitative methods. The first portion of this chapter will examine results of the quantitative data. The second section of this chapter will explore the results of the qualitative data.

Quantitative Analysis

The following research questions from this study were explored using quantitative analysis.

1. Is there a difference between students at the Home Base School and the comparison sites when compared by (a) academic achievement; (b) rates of absenteeism; and (c) number of discipline referrals?

2. Is there a difference between teachers at the Home Base School and teachers at the comparison sites in their efficacy beliefs and their perceptions of highly mobile students' ability to do well in school?

3. Is there a difference between parents of students at the Home Base School and parents of students in the comparison site schools in their perceptions of the learning environment?

4. Is there a difference between students at the Home Base School and the comparison site schools in their perceptions of their own academic efficacy?

Research Question 1: Is there a difference between students at the Home Base School and the comparison sites when compared by (a) academic achievement; (b) rates of absenteeism; and (c) number of discipline referrals?

Academic Achievement

After students were selected for the study, the 1996-97 scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) for reading and mathematics were collected as part of the demographic data for each participant. A t-test was performed on mathematics subtest scores and on reading subtest scores for each group to determine prior academic achievement. The mean scores for each group in reading and mathematics are shown in Table 4.1.

The t-tests indicated no significant difference between the two groups of students (Reading: p=0.28; Mathematics: p= 0.21). Thus, both groups can be assumed to have similar prior academic achievement before the beginning of the study.

To measure academic achievement during the study, a pre-test and post-test were given in reading and mathematics using the Curriculum-Based Assessment (CBA) (Mercer et al., 1996). ANCOVA analysis of reading scores indicated that students at the Home Base School made significantly higher gains in reading than students at the comparison sites (p=.04). The academic gains in mathematics between the two groups of students were not statistically significant (p=.92). The mean scores (M) and standard deviation (SD) for each group on the post-tests are given in Table 4.2. The null hypothesis that there would be no difference in academic achievement between students at the Home Base and comparison site schools was rejected for the measure of reading achievement and was not rejected for the measure of mathematics achievement.

Table 4.1. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Participants' ITBS Scores (1996-97) in Reading and Mathematics

ITBS Subtest	n[a]	Mean	SD
Reading			
Home Base	10	32.1	29.6
Comparison Sites	9	20.4	14.6
Mathematics			
Home Base	9	30.6	32.7
Comparison Sites	9	15.4	12.3

[a]Numbers of children in each group for whom ITBS scores from 1996-97 were available.

Table 4.3 shows the ANCOVA table for the CBA reading scores on the pre- and post-tests. Table 4.4 presents the ANCOVA table for the CBA mathematics scores on the pre- and post-test.

Student Absenteeism

The total number of student absences recorded by the school for the 1997-98 school year were collected for each participant in the study. Absences were analyzed using one-way ANOVA. Mean absences for the year for each group of students are shown in Table 4.5. The ANOVA summary table for absences is shown in Table 4.6.

Table 4.2. Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Adjusted Post-Test Means for Pre- and Post-test in Reading and Mathematics (CBA)

CBA Subtests	n[a]	Pre-Test Mean	SD	Post-Test Mean	SD	Adjusted Post-Test Mean
Reading						
Home Base	10	23.7	16.7	46.7	28.7	66.9
Comparison Sites	9	56.3	34.7	75.0	44.2	52.6
Mathematics						
Home Base	10	36.0	17.6	59.6	18.7	52.4
Comparison Sites	9	19.0	12.9	43.5	25.2	51.6

[a] Number of students in each group taking the pre- and post-test in reading and mathematics

Table 4.3. ANCOVA Summary Table for CBA Reading Scores
Dependent Variable: Post-Test

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	p
Group	1	686.96	686.96	4.77	0.0442
Pre-Test	1	20733.48	20733.48	143.94	0.0001
Error	16	2304.62	144.04		
Total	18	26831.79			

Note: Pre-Test is the covariant

Table 4.4. ANCOVA Summary Table for CBA Mathematics Scores
Dependent Variable: Post-Test

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	p
Group	1	2.58	2.58	0.01	0.9283
Pre-Test	1	3320.99	3320.99	10.74	0.0047
Error	16	4947.64	309.23		
Total	18	9488.00			

Note: Pre-test is the covariant

Table 4.5. Mean and Standard Deviations of Participants' Absences for the 1997-98 School Year

	n[a]	Mean	SD
Home Base	10	13.7	7.9
Comparison Sites	9	6.8	4.6

[a]Number of students in each group

Table 4.6. ANOVA Summary Table for Absences

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	p
Between Group	1	219.75	219.75	5.00	0.039
Within Group	17	746.99	43.94		
Total	18	966.74			

The students at Home Base School had approximately twice as many absences as the students in the comparison sites. The difference in rates of absenteeism was significant (p=.039). The hypothesis that there would be no difference between the Home Base School and the comparison site schools in terms of absenteeism was rejected. Given the higher absences of the Home Base students (approximately twice as many absences as the comparison site students), the gains in reading become even more significant.

Discipline Referrals

Discipline referral data for the 1997-98 school year were collected from the schools for each student in the study. The data were analyzed using one-way ANOVA. The mean number of referrals for each group is listed in Table 4.7. The ANOVA summary table for discipline referrals is shown in Table 4.8.

Table 4.7. Means and Standard Deviations for Discipline Referrals of Participants for the 1997-98 School Year by Group

Group	n[a]	Mean	SD
Home Base	10	0.00	0
Comparison Sites	9	0.88	1.2

[a]Number of students in each group

Table 4.8. ANOVA Summary Table for Participant Discipline Referrals by Group

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	p
Between Group	1	3.74	3.74	4.94	0.04
Within Group	17	12.89	0.76		
Total	18	16.63			

The Home Base students had fewer discipline referrals than comparison site students. In fact, Home Base teachers handled discipline themselves within the classroom setting. When students failed to respond to the teacher-imposed discipline, they were counseled by the director. No instance of Home Base teachers using the formal discipline referral was observed during this study. The null hypothesis that there would be no difference between students at the Home Base School and the comparison site schools in terms of discipline referrals was rejected (p = .04).

Research Question 2: Is there a difference between teachers at the Home Base School and teachers at the comparison sites in their efficacy beliefs and their perceptions of highly mobile students' ability to do well in school?

Fourteen teachers at the Home Base School and at the comparison site schools were asked to complete a researcher-designed survey to measure their own sense of teaching efficacy and their beliefs about the ability of highly mobile students to be successful in school (see Appendix C). Three teachers at the Home Base School and nine teachers from the comparison sites agreed to complete the surveys. Two teachers at the comparison sites and one teacher at the Home Base School did complete the surveys. A t-test was used to analyze the survey data. No significant differences were found between teachers at the Home Base School and teachers at the comparison site schools for measures of teaching efficacy or their perceptions about the ability of highly mobile students to be successful in school (p=.34).

Research Question 3: Is there a difference between parents of students at the Home Base School and parents of students in the comparison site schools in their perceptions of the learning environment?

Parents of participating students were asked to complete the Successful Schools Parent Survey (Florida Successful Schools Project, 1994) to assess their satisfaction with their child's learning environment. A total of 19 parents were asked to respond. Two parents indicated on the informed consent form that they were unwilling to participate in the survey, although they gave permission for their children to participate in the study. Two parent surveys were not returned. A total of 15 surveys were collected (10 from Home Base School [100%] and 5 from the comparison sites [55%]).

The parent survey asked parents to respond to a series of statements about their child's school by selecting one of three choices: agree, disagree, or no opinion. The statements pertained to learning environment issues and included sentences such as "The teachers help my child learn." and "Teachers at this school expect all children to be successful." A complete copy of the parent survey may be obtained by contacting the

Florida Successful Schools Project, Florida Title I State Evaluation Advisory Panel, Tallahassee, Florida.

A chi-square analysis was performed on the parent surveys. The results indicated two areas of difference. The parents of the Home Base School participants indicated that they felt more welcome in their child's classroom than did parents of participants at the comparison site school (p=.004) in response to statement 5 of the survey: "I feel welcome when I visit my child's classroom." Parents of the Home Base students indicated that they felt more involved and perceived themselves as having been consulted for ideas to a greater extent than did parents of students at the comparison sites (p=.02) in response to statement 11 of the survey: "I have been asked to give ideas on how to improve the school." The null hypothesis that there would be no difference between parents at the Home Base and comparison school sites in terms of their satisfaction with their child's learning environment was rejected.

During observations it was noted that parents of the highly mobile students were much more frequently involved in activities at the Home Base School than at the comparison site schools. Over the course of the seven months, parents and family members of Home Base students were observed attending two programs performed by students and visiting in the classroom on two occasions. Also, parents and family members attended a breakfast at a local restaurant with their children's classes, a Valentine's Day luncheon prepared by their children, and a Family Day held by the school. At the comparison sites, no parental involvement from the participants' parents was observed.

Research Question 4: Is there a difference between students at the Home Base School and the comparison site schools in their perceptions of their own academic efficacy?

A survey of academic self-efficacy, based on Bandura's self-efficacy studies, was administered individually to participants (See Appendix B). A t-test was used to analyze the results of the survey data. Mean scores for each group are given in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Participants' Academic Self-Efficacy Survey Responses by Group

Group	n[a]	Mean	SD	p
Home Base	10	4.25	0.44	0.02
Comparison Sites	9	3.81	0.34	

[a]Number of students in each group

Students at the Home Base School demonstrated a higher sense of academic self-efficacy (p=.02) than students at the comparison sites. Qualitative data analysis also supports the finding that Home Base participants demonstrated high academic self-efficacy behaviors more frequently than did participants at the comparison sites.

Qualitative Analysis

The following research questions from this study were explored using qualitative analysis.

5. Is there a qualitative difference between teachers at the Home Base School and comparison site schools in their use of instructional strategies?

6. Is there a difference between the Home Base School and comparison site school participants in their beliefs about their ability to do well in school?

7. Is there a difference between the Home Base School and comparison site school participants in their sense of school affiliation?

Guidelines for structuring the observations were questions developed by the researcher based on instructional frameworks suggested by Joyce and Weil (1996) (see Appendix A). The data from the observations was analyzed as described previously in Chapter 3. Behaviors were coded as they occurred, so that an individual student or teacher might have many instances of a particular behavior whereas another student or teacher might have only a few instances of the behavior. The frequency with which a behavior occurs is an important qualitative factor in assessing the learning environment. After each observation was coded by domain, behaviors were tallied by individual and then by group. Group results are reported.

Instructional Models and Learning Environment

The first domain focused on the identification of the instructional model or models being used throughout the instructional period. Instructional models are powerful ways of teaching that provide students with tools to become effective learners (Joyce & Weil, 1996). The conceptual frameworks for an instructional model help teachers plan the orientation to the material, the learning activities, the teacher's instructional behavior, the materials and environment needed, and the level of structure provided by the teacher

(Behar-Horenstein, personal communication, April 1, 1999). Joyce and Weil (1996) classify models of teaching into four major groups: information-processing, social, personal, and behavioral systems.

Information-processing models focus on intellectual development, helping students learn to construct knowledge through conceptual control of material (Joyce & Calhoun, 1996). The information-processing models are listed in Table 4.10.

The social models of teaching and learning are designed to foster social interaction and the development of learning communities. Students learn to work together and build on the synergy that is created from collaboration (Joyce & Weil, 1996; Joyce & Calhoun, 1996). Social models of teaching are shown in Table 4.11.

Personal models of instruction help students develop self-confidence and build emotional and mental health. They also help students begin to set personal goals and aspirations for education, to acquire skills in thinking creatively, and to express themselves effectively. Instructional models from the personal family help students build empathy for others and acquire a realistic self-concept (Joyce & Weil, 1996; Joyce & Calhoun, 1996). The personal family of teaching models in shown in Table 4.12.

Table 4.10. Information-Processing Models

MODEL	PURPOSE
Inductive Thinking	To classify information and concepts, build conceptual understanding of disciplines, and learn to build and test hypotheses based on classifications.
Concept Attainment	To learn specific concepts and strategies to attain them, gain control over subject matter, build hypotheses, and study thinking.
Scientific Inquiry	To acquire scientific process, knowledge bases, and major concepts of specific disciplines. Conceptual thinking, hypothetical reasoning and ability to think critically are developed.
Inquiry Training	To learn how to reason causally, collect data, build concepts, and develop and test hypotheses.
Cognitive Growth	To increase intellectual growth.
Advanced Organizer	To increase ability to synthesize and organize information from multiple sources.
Mnemonics	To develop strategies for mastering new concepts, facts, and ideas.
Synectics	To use analogies to develop creative capacity.

Source: Behar-Horenstein and Ganet-Sigel, in press (adapted from Joyce and Calhoun (1996). Creating learning experiences: The role of instructional theory and research. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development pp. 10-11).

Table 4.11. Social Models

MODEL	PURPOSE
Group Investigation	To reflect upon one's self and one's own values, develop a commitment to improving society, and participate productively in a democracy.
Social Inquiry	To work together to solve social problems, and develop strategies for problem-solving.
Jurisprudential Inquiry	To analyze issues of public interest using a legal framework.
Laboratory Method	To develop strong and sensitive social skills while learning how to understand group dynamics.
Role Playing	To learn strategies for resolving conflict and social problems.
Positive Interdependence	To learn how to work together interdependently and appreciate the nature of self-others relationships.
Structured Social Inquiry	To learn to work together cooperatively in the pursuit of academic inquiry.

Source: Behar-Horenstein and Ganet-Sigel, in press (adapted from Joyce and Calhoun (1996). Creating learning experiences: The role of instructional theory and research. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development pp. 10-11).

Table 4.12. Personal Models

MODEL	PURPOSE
Nondirective Teaching	To build capacity for self-development and create personal awareness.
Awareness Training	To enhance personal growth through self-understanding, increasing empathy, and sensitivity towards others.
Classroom Meeting	To increase responsibility to self and others. To increase self-understanding.
Self-Actualization	To increase capacity for personal development and self-understanding.
Conceptual Systems	To increase one's own flexibility in interacting with others and propel individuals to higher levels of conceptual development as they learn to process information.

Source: Behar-Horenstein and Ganet-Sigel, in press (adapted from Joyce and Calhoun (1996). Creating learning experiences: The role of instructional theory and research. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development pp. 10-11).

Behavioral instructional models are based on the notion that behavior is governed by stimulus and response. Behaviorists believe that, given favorable conditions and appropriate time, anyone can learn (or change) specific observable behaviors (Joyce & Weil, 1996). The behavioral family of models is shown in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13. Behavioral Systems Models

MODEL	PURPOSE
Social Learning	To develop an understanding of one's own behavior and its consequences. To develop more adaptive behaviors in order to attain goals.
Mastery Learning	To master content in all subject areas.
Programmed Learning	To master academic content. To help students monitor their own growth and modify learning strategies.
Simulation	To apply problem-solving concepts and problem-solving skills in situations that approximate realistic conditions.
Direct Teaching	To master academic content, enhance motivation, and learn how to pace oneself.
Anxiety Reduction	To learn how to control aversive emotions and avert dysfunctional responses.

Source: Behar-Horenstein and Ganet-Sigel, in press (adapted from Joyce and Calhoun (1996). Creating learning experiences: The role of instructional theory and research. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development pp. 10-11).

The explicit use of teaching models can provide powerful learning tools for students which help them overcome the presumed limitations of race, gender, culture, and socioeconomic status (Joyce & Weil, 1996). Many of these models have been shown to accelerate the learning process for students of all abilities and in all curriculum areas (Joyce & Calhoun, 1996). Thus, one of the most important questions in this study was whether or not teachers at Home Base School and/or the comparison sites used a variety of explicit teaching models to enhance learning.

Instructional models were identified in the analysis of each observation. Then each occurrence of each model was tallied to indicate the variety of instructional models used and the frequency with which they occurred in each classroom. A chart of instructional models used was constructed for the classrooms observed at both the Home Base School and the comparison site schools. Teachers at the Home Base School used a greater variety of instructional models and used them with greater frequency than did teachers at the comparison site schools. Table 4.14 indicates the models which were used and the frequency with which each model occurred in both the Home Base School and the comparison site schools. Direct instruction was the predominant teaching model in all settings. All of the schools used scripted mathematics and reading programs which were designed to be implemented using direct instruction.

Also of interest is the number of different instructional models used by each teacher. Each model used by a teacher was recorded each time it was used and then the number of different models used was counted by teacher. Teachers who used several models tended to vary their techniques frequently. Table 4.15 reports the mean of instructional models used for each group of teachers.

Table 4.14. Percentages of Instructional Models Used (and Number of Observed Uses) by Group

Instructional Model (Family of Model)	% for Home Base School (Number Observed) (N[a]=100)	% for Comparison Sites (Number Observed) (N[b]=74)
Direct Instruction (behavioral)	51% (n=51)	65% (n=48)
Simulation (behavioral)	11% (n=11)	3% (n=2)
Inductive Thinking (information-processing)	11% (n=11)	9% (n=7)
Synectics (information-processing)	8% (n=8)	3% (n=2)
Classroom Meeting (personal)	6% (n=6)	0% (n=0)
Advance Organizer (information-processing)	3% (n=3)	0% (n=0)
Mnemonics (information-processing)	3% (n=3)	0% (n=0)
Concept Attainment (information-processing)	2% (n=2)	8% (n=6)
Nondirective Teaching (personal)	2% (n=2)	0% (n=0)
Role-Playing (social)	2% (n=2)	1% (n=1)
Group Investigation (social)	1% (n=1)	1% (n=1)
No Instruction/No Model	0% (n=0)	9% (n=7)

[a] Number of observed occurrences at Home Base School

[b] Number of observed occurrences at comparison site schools

Table 4.15. Mean Number of Teaching Models Observed by Teacher Group

Group	n[a]	Mean
Home Base	4	6.25
Comparison Sites	11	1.82

[a]Number of teachers observed in each group

While it is important to know if a variety of explicit teaching models are being used, it is also important to classify teaching models by family and see if teachers are using models from a variety of instructional families. Teachers at the Home Base School were observed using teaching models from all of the four families of models. No models from the personal family were observed at the comparison sites. For both groups, the most often used teaching models came from the behavioral family (direct teaching, simulation), with the information-processing family (inductive thinking, synectics, advanced organizers, concept attainment, mnemonics) representing the next highest frequency. Role-playing and group investigation were used infrequently, at the same rates by the teachers at the Home Base School and comparison site schools.

Teachers' Instructional Activities

Kohn (1996) described an ideal learning climate as one in which students have choices and participate in decision-making, teachers collaborate with the students in learning activities, and students' interests help to shape the curriculum. He categorized learning environments in classrooms as "working with" environments where teachers help to create a positive learning situation or “doing to” environments where teachers seek to control student behavior through punishments and rewards. Teachers’ instructional activities, their responses to all the students in their classes, and their interactions with the students under observation all contributed to the learning environment of each classroom.

The frequency of the instructional activities carried out by each teacher was recorded. Activities were coded each separate time they occurred, so if a teacher changed activities frequently he/she would have a higher total of instructional activities than the teacher who followed one activity for a long period of time. The total number of instructional behaviors for teachers from the Home Base School and the teachers from the comparison site schools were counted separately. Table 4.16 lists the instructional activities observed, the total number of each activity observed for the group of Home Base teachers and the group of comparison site teachers, and the percentage that each activity represented of the total observed instructional activities by group.

Teachers at the Home Base School spent more time demonstrating and modeling the desired academic skill than did comparison site teachers. Teachers at the Home Base School were also more likely to include building metacognitive strategies as part of their regular instruction than were teachers at the comparison site schools.

Table 4.16. Percentages of Instructional Activities Observed (and Number Observed) for Teachers by Group

Instructional Activity	% for Home Base School (Number Observed) (N^a = 284)	% for Comparison Site Schools (Number Observed) (N^b = 235)
Providing Explicit Information	29% (n=81)	31% (n=74)
Demonstrating/Modeling	11% (n=31)	6% (n=13)
Disciplining Students	1% (n=5)	9% (n=21)
Facilitating Learning	12% (n=33)	9% (n=22)
Praising Students	15% (n=43)	9% (n=21)
Monitoring Student Work	10% (n=27)	11% (n=27)
Eliciting Student Responses	10% (n=28)	14% (n=32)
Evaluating Student Performance	6% (n=18)	9% (n=20)
Building Metacognitive Strategies	6% (n=18)	2% (n=5)

[a] Total number of instructional strategies observed of Home Base teachers
[b] Total number of instructional strategies observed of comparison site teachers

A comparison between both groups of teachers revealed that the Home Base and comparison site teachers spent almost equivalent amounts of time facilitating learning, monitoring student work, eliciting student responses, and providing explicit information. Teachers at the comparison sites used more instructional time for disciplining students than did teachers at the Home Base School. Both groups of teachers spent slightly less than one-third of the time providing explicit information.

Instructional Activities of Students

In the same manner as teachers' instructional activities, the activities in which students engaged during instruction were coded, tallied by individual student, and then calculated for each group. Behavior was coded for each separate time it was observed. Students were considered to be attentive to the teacher if they appeared to be listening quietly and if they followed teacher instructions as given. Students were considered to be engaged with the task if they worked as instructed, even if the teacher was not lecturing or demonstrating. Students would often remain on task and work on assignments, even though they appeared to be inattentive while the teacher was talking. This accounts for the two separate categories of behavior (attentive to the teacher and engaged with the lesson) and for the higher number in the category "engaged with lesson." Students were considered to be inattentive to the teacher if they were talking, playing, or disrupting others while the teacher was instructing. They were considered to be unengaged with the lesson if they delayed or refused to do the assigned task. Productive instructional activities included being attentive to the teacher and being engaged with the task assigned.

Home Base students were more attentive (20%) than comparison site students (9%) and more engaged (27%) than comparison site students (15%).

Table 4.17. Percentages of Participants' Observed Instructional Activities (and Number Observed) by Group

Observed Instructional Activities	% Observed at Home Base School (Number Observed) (N^a = 255)	% Observed at Comparison Site Schools (Number Observed) (N^b = 360)
Productive activities		
Attentive to Teacher	20% (n=51)	9% (n=34)
Engaged with Lesson	27% (n=70)	15% (n=54)
Unproductive activities		
Inattentive to Teacher	22% (n=56)	36% (n=128)
Unengaged with Lesson	31% (n=78)	40% (n=144)

[a] Total observed instructional activities of Home Base students
[b] Total observed instructional activities of comparison site students

At the Home Base School, participants engaged in productive instructional activities 47% of the time, compared with participants from the comparison site schools who engaged in productive instructional activities only 24% of the time. Inattention to the teacher and being unengaged with the work were considered unproductive instructional activities. In both groups, students engaged in a higher incidence of unproductive instructional activities than productive activities. The Home Base participants exhibited unproductive instructional activities 53% of the time, compared with unproductive instructional activities which were exhibited 76% of the time by participants at the comparison site schools. Table 4.17 indicates the instructional activities and the number of times each activity was observed.

Teachers' and Students' Instructional Roles

Teachers were considered to take an active instructional role when they participated in the students' learning activities. Examples of this participation included dialogues, demonstrations, or questioning. Teachers were considered to take a directive role when they simply gave students instructions about what to do without any other participation in the academic activity. Instructional roles were considered to be supportive when teachers provided the organization and structure to engage students in on-task behavior. Supportive roles also included the teacher's verbal encouragement to students while they were working or assistance as the teacher circulated to answer questions and provide help while students were working. If the teacher exhibited a punitive or critical attitude towards student academic endeavors, their role was considered to be unsupportive. In addition, a teacher's instructional role was termed unsupportive if he/she distracted the students or failed to provide a quiet, organized atmosphere in which to work. Occasionally, some teachers would attend to administrative tasks (grading papers, entering grades, etc.) and ignore the students. These roles were also coded as unsupportive. Table 4.18 shows the observed instructional roles of teachers by group.

Table 4.18. Percentages of Observed Instructional Roles (and Number of Observed Roles) for Teachers by Group

Observed Instructional Roles	% Observed at Home Base School (Number Observed)	% Observed at Comparison Site Schools (Number Observed)
Active/Directive	(N^a=86)	(N^b=69)
Active	65% (n=56)	30% (n=21)
Directive	35% (n=30)	70% (n=48)
Supportive/Unsupportive	(N^c=104)	(N^d=70)
Supportive	96% (n=100)	63% (n=44)
Unsupportive	4% (n=4)	37% (n=26)

[a] Total number of observed roles for active/directive parameter at Home Base School
[b] Total number of observed roles for active/directive parameter at comparison site schools
[c] Total number of observed roles for supportive/unsupportive parameter at Home Base School
[d] Total number of observed roles for supportive/unsupportive parameter at comparison site schools

Note. Eight instances of unsupportive behaviors at the comparison sites were attributed to interns or substitute teachers. Two instances of unsupportive behaviors at Home Base School were attributed to an intern.

The behaviors listed in Table 4.18 were considered as two separate parameters. The active/directive parameter reflected the teacher's level of involvement with the students. That involvement was ranked as active if the teacher worked with the students to facilitate comprehension of material. It was ranked as directive if the teacher was delivering information to students, giving assignments, or otherwise orchestrating students' work without proximity or personal involvement. At the Home Base School, teachers took an active instructional role 65% of the time. At the comparison site schools, teachers were actively involved 30% of the time.

The supportive/unsupportive parameter considered the teacher's role in facilitating learning. A supportive role was one in which the teacher made sure that students had every opportunity to do well. For example, the room was quiet and orderly, materials were available as students needed them, assistance was available if students needed help, and the teacher supervised student work. An unsupportive atmosphere was one in which the teacher was uninvolved, not proximate, or totally disengaged from the student activity. Home Base teachers played a supportive role almost without exception (96% of observed behaviors). Comparison site teachers played a supportive role 63% of the time.

It should be noted that of the 26 observed instances of unsupportive instructional roles in the comparison site schools, almost one-third (n=8) were attributed to substitutes (n=4) and interns (n=4). Half of the unsupportive instructional roles observed at the Home Base School (n=2) were attributed to an intern.

Students were also given instructional roles by virtue of the instructional models selected by the teachers. Students were judged to be self-directive if they had any choice of activities. If students were told exactly what to do and how to do it, the student role was judged to be other-directed. Home Base students were more frequently self-directed

(48%) when compared to the comparison site students (14%). Also, the students' instructional role was evaluated according to whether students had freedom of movement or restricted movement. In some classrooms, students had considerable flexibility to move around the room as long as they were staying on task. These students were considered to have freedom of movement. In other classrooms, students were not able to move from their seats without teacher permission. These students were considered to have restricted movement. Students at the Home Base School had considerably more freedom of movement (46%) than students at the comparison site schools (4%).

Each parameter was considered as a whole when tabulating percentages. In other words, self-directed/other-directed was considered to be one parameter, the total of which equaled 100%. The same was true for freedom of movement/restricted movement. Table 4.19 indicates the instructional roles observed for the two groups of students by percentage and by total number of observed behaviors. Observational data indicated that students at the Home Base School had more opportunities to make choices about what they would do and how to do it and had much greater freedom of movement than did students at the comparison site schools.

Instructional grouping has an impact on learning environment. All of the sites used combinations of whole group, small group, and individual instruction. In addition, Home Base School occasionally combined the classes of two or more teachers for special activities. However, the frequency of use varied between groups. Some teachers maintained the same grouping for an entire instructional period. Other teachers shifted often from one group size to another.

Table 4.19. Percentages of Students' Instructional Roles (and Number Observed) by Student Group

Students' Instructional Roles	% Observed at Home Base School (Number Observed)	% Observed at Comparison Site Schools (Number Observed)
Self-Directed/Other-Directed	(N^a=81)	(N^b=65)
Self-Directed	48% (n=39)	14% (n=9)
Other-Directed	52% (n=43)	86% (n=56)
Free/Restricted Movement	(N^c=57)	(N^d=55)
Freedom of Movement	46% (n=26)	4% (n=2)
Restricted Movement	54% (n=31)	96% (n=53)

[a] Total observed instructional roles for self-directed/other-directed parameter at Home Base School.

[b] Total observed instructional roles for self-directed/other-directed parameter at comparison site schools.

[c] Total observed instructional roles for free/restricted movement parameter at Home Base School.

[d] Total observed instructional roles for free/restricted movement parameter at comparison site schools.

Small group was the predominate instructional organization at the Home Base School (42%) while whole group instruction was more frequently used at the comparison site schools (54%). Table 4.20 indicates the frequency of instructional organizations by group. Percentages and total observed frequencies are reported.

Table 4.20. Percentages of Observed Instructional Organization (and Number Observed) by Group

Instructional Organization	% Observed at Home Base School (Number Observed) ($N^a = 99$)	% Observed at Comparison Site Schools (Number Observed) ($N^b = 72$)
Combined Classes (2 or more teachers)	3% (n=3)	0% (n=0)
Whole Group	25% (n=25)	54% (n=39)
Small Group	42% (n=42)	25% (n=18)
Individual	29% (n=29)	21% (n=15)

[a] Total observed instructional organizations at Home Base School
[b] Total observed instructional organizations at comparison site schools

The leadership of the instructional group is as significant as the instructional organization. Instructional groups were coded as being led by the teacher, an intern, a substitute, or a teacher's aide. Table 4.21 indicates the frequency of group leadership by these respective authority figures.

The major difference in leadership of instructional groups between the Home Base School and the comparison site schools is found in the number of substitutes and interns observed in the comparison sites. Twenty-eight percent of instructional groups observed in the comparison sites were led by either a substitute or an intern. Only one of the instructional groups observed at the Home Base School was led by an intern. No daily substitutes were observed at the Home Base School.

Table 4.21. Percentages of Observed Leadership of Instructional Groups (and Number Observed) by Group

Instructional Group Leader	% Observed at Home Base School (Number Observed) (N[a] = 57)	% Observed at Comparison Site Schools (Number Observed) (N[b] = 53)
Teacher-led Group	91% (n=52)	70% (n=37)
Aide-led Group	7% (n=4)	2% (n=1)
Intern-led Group	2% (n=1)	19% (n=10)
Substitute-led Group	0% (n=0)	9% (n=5)

[a] Total observed for Home Base School
[b] Total observed for comparison site schools

Instructional supports both influence and are influenced by the teaching model chosen. All of the schools involved in the study used a scripted curriculum for reading and mathematics, so all classes depended to a large extent on commercially prepared materials for instructional support and on direct instruction as a teaching model. However, some teachers modified these instructional supports more than others by adding teaching models that incorporated teacher-designed or student-designed materials.

During the analysis of data, observations were coded to determine whether the instructional supports were pre-planned (commercially prepared), teacher-designed, or student-designed. Obviously, a combination of these materials were often used in a given lesson.

In addition, the use of instructional supports was coded as either prescribed or emergent/creative. In prescribed uses, the instructional supports were designed to elicit responses which were judged as correct or incorrect without an opportunity for students to create personal meanings or multiple interpretations. In most cases, pre-planned instructional supports were used in a prescribed manner, although some teacher-designed materials were also used in this way. For example, a scripted reading lesson following the teacher's manual, a pre-printed worksheet, and a spelling bee would all be considered as prescribed use of instructional supports, even though the spelling bee was a teacher-designed instructional support. Use of instructional supports was coded as emergent/creative if the teacher allowed students to interact with the teaching materials to develop personal understanding. Reading and discussing a story, writing an essay, and performing a play are all examples of materials that are used in a creative or emergent fashion.

The type and use of instructional supports was coded for each observation and compiled by group. Table 4.22 indicates the type and use of instructional supports by group.

Table 4.22. Percentages of Observed Type and Use of Instructional Supports (and Number Observed) by Group

	% Observed at Home Base School (Number Observed)	% Observed at Comparison Site Schools (Number Observed)
Type of Instructional Support	(N^a = 108)	(N^b = 78)
Pre-Planned	46% (n=50)	62% (n=48)
Teacher-Designed	40% (n=43)	29% (n=23)
Student-Designed	14% (n=15)	9% (n=7)
Use of Instructional Supports	(N^c = 93)	(N^d = 68)
Prescribed	54% (n=50)	81% (n=55)
Emergent/Creative	46% (n=43)	19% (n=13)

[a] Total types of instructional supports observed at Home Base School
[b] Total types of instructional supports observed at comparison site schools
[c] Total uses of instructional supports observed at Home Base School
[d] Total uses of instructional supports observed at comparison site schools

Teachers at the Home Base School frequently expanded the commercial curriculum to include teacher- and student-designed materials (a combined total of 54%), whereas teachers at the comparison site schools more often relied on commercially prepared materials (62%). In addition, teachers at the Home Base School more frequently used instructional supports in an emergent or creative manner (46%) than did the teachers at the comparison site schools (19%).

Examples of Instructional Strategies

The following excerpts from classroom observations are used to illustrate the application of various instructional strategies in each site. In the first excerpt, the teacher is using a direct instruction model.

October 27, 1997: [Home Base School] *Mrs. Abbott teaches a combined first and second grade class at the Home Base School. Today she has brought in several types of games. She has a Toss-Across game, bean bags, a Light-Bright game, a train station with train tracks, little race cars, a Topple game, Checkers, and Legos. The teacher begins by demonstrating tic-tac-toe. Then she brings out the Toss-Across game and shows the students how to play it. She shows the students how to put together the train tracks and finally demonstrates how to play Topple. These are all games for the students to play when they have finished their work. At the end of each day, students have center time when they can select what they want to do. The teacher discusses with the students the rules of the games. They also discuss the rules of sharing, how to care for the toys, and the behavior she expects from the students.*

In the following excerpt, the teacher uses role-playing to enhance her instruction.

March 26, 1998: [Home Base School] *Mrs. Abbott tells the whole class that she is going to introduce two important math concepts. She draws geometric shapes on the board: a circle, a square, a triangle, an oval, a diamond, and a rectangle. As she points to the shapes, the students call out the name of each shape. She tells students that they* *need to know how to divide shapes so the division is fair to everyone. She uses the analogy of dividing a piece of cake between her son and daughter. She shows an equal division by drawing a line through the middle of one shape. Then she shows an unequal division. She says the equal division is "symmetrical" and it is a fair way to divide something. Then she divides more shapes on the board by drawing lines. She asks the students, "Is this symmetrical? Is it fair? Would you be happy if you got this piece?" The students answer "Yes!" or "No!" enthusiastically. David asks her, "Can you pick one boy and one girl to act like they are your son and daughter?" Mrs. Abbott says, "Okay." She calls David and Lucy to the front of the room and names them Jud and Sara. She explains to them that she has a personal pan pizza for them to divide, and she draws it on the board, adding the ingredients. She says, "Here's some pepperoni, some mushrooms, some green peppers, a little sausage." She tells Jud and Sara they can share the pizza. Sara takes the chalk and divides the circle into four equal parts. Mrs. Abbott asks her, "Which pieces are yours?" Sara points to two pieces. Then Mrs. Abbott asks, "Which pieces are Jud's?" Sara points to the other two. Mrs. Abbott asks Jud, "Are you happy with that?" He shakes his head indicating "Yes." The students at their desks laugh and offer comments. Then the teacher says, "Well, I just happen to have one brownie left in the refrigerator. You can divide that." Jud takes the chalk and divides the brownie into two unequal pieces. The teacher asks him which piece is his. Students at their desks shout, "Take the big piece," but Jud indicates the smaller piece. The teacher asks Sara, "Are you happy?" Sara shakes her head to indicate yes, but the class shouts out, "No, it* *isn't fair." Mrs. Abbott then continues her explanation of fractions after David and Lucy go back to their seats.*

The play rehearsal (and performing the play later on) is an example of using simulation as an instructional strategy. The students are applying important cognitive and kinesthetic skills as they gain poise and expertise.

February 26, 1998: [Home Base School] *The students in Mrs. Abbott's class are getting ready for a play. Mr. Blake's class is in the play with them, performing as the chorus. Mrs. Perez's class is giving the cast party after the performance. Today is play practice. The play has been written by the teacher and is based on a story book they read in class called King Bidgood's in the Bathtub and He Won't Come Out.*

The students and aides have created a variety of props: princess hats made from cones of poster paper and trimmed with glitter, chiffon, and ribbons; cardboard swords painted gold, crowns, a large cake made from cardboard and decorated with plastic fruit, a platter of plastic fruit and vegetables. As they are preparing to leave the classroom to go to the auditorium, the students gather up props. A boy picks up the three-tiered cardboard cake decorated with plastic fruit. LaKesha gets up and says, "That mine. I supposed to carry it."

LaKesha is dressed in a black satin and white lace costume that looks like it came from a dance recital. Several other girls are dressed in finery of the same sort. LaKesha carries the cake down to the auditorium. She lets the other girls grab the cake. They are tossing it around. Geraldine drops the cake and several pieces of plastic fruit fall off. LaKesha starts to get angry, but the aide says calmly, "Oh, that's fixable."

As they get to the auditorium, the teacher tells the students to please sit in their places. The students are very noisy, and many of them are moving around. They are having a hard time settling down. The teacher asks them, "What's important here?" The students begin to calm down a little. They are waiting for Mr. Blake's class to come and join them. The teacher tells her waiting class, "You are doing a great job." After Mr. Blake's class comes in, the rehearsal begins. Mrs. Abbott starts them, after several tries, with "Ready . . . Set . . . Action." The students begin their lines.

Katy, Lucy, LaKesha, and Ginger troop onstage. They are a chorus of young ladies bringing things to the king. LaKesha sucks her thumb on stage. The third graders in the chorus laugh loudly at the girls. Mrs. Abbott praises their performance, "Perfect! Noses in the air! Perfect!" The second graders remember most of their lines.

After the first rehearsal, Mrs. Abbott quiets the children, who are running around excitedly, by clapping her hands in a rhythmic pattern. The students quiet down as they begin to imitate her clapping pattern, responding to her lead. When she has them all in rhythm and quiet, she stops clapping and tells students softly, "Hands in your laps." The school principal and another teacher have come in to watch the rehearsal. The students are controlling the stage lights, providing the narration, reciting their lines, and singing loudly in the chorus. The teachers give the students lots of praise for their performance. They praise them for knowing their parts and tell the students what a great play it is. They also give them some tips like, "Listen for your cue" and "Remember to be quiet back stage." Mrs. Abbott gives the students more praise and closes with the traditional good luck wish, "Break a leg." She explains to them what that means.

In the following situation, Mrs. Perez is employing a direct instruction teaching model.

December 3, 1997: [Home Base School] *Mrs. Perez has just taken over this combined second and third grade class. The students have been pulled from Mrs. Abbott's class and Mr. Blake's class. Mrs. Perez is teaching the students to play a Math Bingo game. She writes out a math problem on the overhead transparency. She asks students to work the problem and to cover the answer on their bingo card. After the students have had time to think, she calls on one student to work the problem aloud. She reinforces behavior while she is instructing. She says, "I love hearing these nice manners. Only talk one at a time and be polite to each other." When a student answers a question, she asks, "Tell me how you figured that out." She demonstrates how to work the problem on the overhead projector. She says, "I'll count to five in my head to give you thinking time. Raise your hand if you agree with the answer. Tell me why you think it's right."*

Direct instruction was frequently used in all classes, particularly in the scripted mathematics and reading curriculum adopted by all of the schools in the study. This excerpt illustrates how the scripted curriculum is enacted for mathematics.

November 4, 1997: [Comparison Site] *Mrs. Deane has a third grade mathematics class. She directs the students to find the proper lesson in their workbooks. Then she says, "Get ready to read the numerals. What numeral?" The students respond by saying the numerals aloud in unison. Mrs. Deane says, "Touch numeral A. Get ready to answer. Your turn. How many hundreds? Tens? Left-overs? Write the answer."*

Mrs. Deane continues, "A row goes from side to side. What does a row do?" Again the students respond in unison.

When the students are given seat work to do, Mrs. Deane walks around the room, checks for their comprehension, and offers help. She praises the students frequently. She says, "Good job. Put a plus there and it will be perfect. Look how neat your paper is! Very good. Look how fast you are. How'd you write so fast? Did you take a smart pill this morning?" The students respond with a smile or by saying "thank you."

The reading curriculum at each school was also scripted and relied heavily on direct instruction. The following passage is typical of the direct instruction model used to teach reading classes with the *Reading Mastery* curriculum.

March 31, 1998: [Home Base School] *Mr. Blake teaches a combined class of third and fourth graders. Today they are having a reading lesson. The reading curriculum is scripted. Mr. Blake begins reviewing the new words that will be in the story, following the scripted dialogue in the teacher's manual. He says, "That word is weigh. Spell weigh." The students spell the word aloud in unison. Then he says, "What word did you spell?" The students repeat the word. They go through the entire list of words this way and then read through the list again quickly. Mr. Blake praises the group. "Good job reading the words." He also tells them, "I need to hear everybody's voice."*

Next Mr. Blake has students read columns of words. First the group reads the column of words together in unison. Then Mr. Blake discusses the meanings for the words. The meanings, the sample sentences, and the requests for responses from students are all scripted. After they have finished the definitions, the group reads the column of *words again. Mr. Blake says, "I am so proud of you guys for getting all those words." Then he calls on individual students to read the columns of words.*

Many students volunteer to read. Andrea, the student I am observing, does not volunteer. She drills a hole in a flat eraser with her pencil while other students answer questions and respond to the teacher.

The story is about the Trojan Horse. Mr. Blake calls on individual students to read parts of the story. Andrea finally volunteers. She gets stuck on the second word. Another student helps her. She makes a mistake in reading two more words in the passage. When she is done, Mr. Blake says, "Good job." Mr. Blake asks questions about previous stories the group has read leading up to this story. He asks, "Why do you think this happened? What do you think will happen?" He asks factual questions about the story, too. He says, "Touch the door on the horse. How many soldiers had been hiding in the horse? What does the story tell you about solving a problem?"

The following excerpt is another example of direct instruction.

November 13, 1997: [Comparison Site] *Mrs. Kaufman teaches a third grade reading class. The reading curriculum is scripted. On my first observation, Mrs. Kaufman told me these students were "the lowest of the low."*

Today Mrs. Kaufman begins, "Touch under the item. Read the word." The students were instructed to read the word aloud when the teacher claps her hands, but they are not in unison. Mrs. Kaufman stops them and repeats the directions. The students are still not in unison. She stops them again. She raises her voice and repeats the directions *once more. She tells the students they must read the story together, taking turns as she calls on them and without making more than five errors total.*

Throughout the lesson, Mrs. Kaufman comments to students. She says, "If you lose your place, you lose your turn. I'll count that as a wrong. The other group read the story three times. You have three mistakes. Okay guys, no more mistakes now until the end."

Miranda, the student I am observing, is selected to read aloud. She reads the first sentence with no errors, but makes a mistake on the next sentence. That is the sixth error for the group, which means they must start over.

The lesson proceeds and again, Miranda is asked to read. Once again, she makes the last error, so the group has to start over again. Jody, Taylor, and Robbie jump up and groan. Mrs. Kaufman points out that all of the group members have made mistakes.

Mrs. Hartman used role-playing and synectics to teach her students in the following lesson.

October 14, 1997: [Comparison Site] *This is a second grade language arts class. The teacher, Mrs. Hartman, has just posed a question to the students about what kinds of healthy choices they can make. Mrs. Hartman poses a scenario and does a role-playing activity with a student. She pretends to be a drug dealer who comes up to one of the students at football practice and offers him drugs. She mentions several drugs by name. The student responds, turning her down. She continues in the role, and repeats her offer. The student responds to her with reasons why he wouldn't do drugs.*

Once the teacher has played this scenario with one student, she switches to another and then another, making the same offer. The teacher interjects praise and affirms the students' reasoning as she goes along.

Students are then encouraged to suggest other ways to be healthy. Mrs. Hartman lists their suggestions on the marker board. She praises students and uses follow-up questions to encourage them to think more deeply or to explore ideas.

The students are to write a paragraph about three things to do to have a healthy lifestyle. Mrs. Hartman encourages the students to use a topic sentence and provide supporting details.

As the students finish their paragraphs, Mrs. Hartman hands out large sheets of paper. The students are to draw and illustrate the points in their paragraph. The only direction she gives them is to include the title of the assignment: User/Loser: Be Smart--Don't Start. Beyond that, the students are to draw whatever they wish. As the students work, Mrs. Hartman circulates around the room. When students ask a question, she helps them by reminding them of what they know or reminding them of the process for figuring out the answer.

Teachers at the Home Base School frequently used the class meeting model as an instructional technique. This technique was not observed in use at any of the comparison site schools.

October 16, 1997: [Home Base School] *The students in Mrs. Abbott's class are finishing their work. As they finish up, she calls the children to come and sit at her rocking chair. She says she wants to discuss a class problem. She tells the students that it* *is very distracting for her to have students playing with the race track (after they have finished their work) when she is trying to teach. It is too noisy. She says, "My favorite word to say to students is 'Yes.' How can we solve our problem?" The students begin to raise their hands and offer suggestions. The teacher responds to each suggestion, and they all discuss various options. She and the students decide that the game will be placed outside the door on the sidewalk and when students finish their work, they may go out and play with it as long as they stay within that sidewalk square and do not wander away. The game must also be put away when they are finished.*

In the following situation, Mrs. Abbott uses nondirective teaching with a student who talks about a possible family relocation.

January 6, 1998: [Home Base School] *As David comes in, Mrs. Abbott walks over and greets him with a big hug. He had not been there yesterday, the first day back from Christmas vacation, so she says she is very glad to see him today. Another teacher walking through the room also greets David enthusiastically. David is talking quietly with Mrs. Abbott. I cannot hear what he is saying; I can only hear her responses. Mrs. Abbott says, "You're moving? Your whole family is moving?" She asks him how he feels about the move and tells him how much the teachers and the director care about him and his whole family. She asks for various details about the move. After lots of hugs, she sends him over to get his breakfast. He goes to his seat and eats quietly all by himself.*

Simulation was a popular instructional strategy at the Home Base School. It was observed far less at the comparison sites. The following excerpts show situations in which simulation was used.

February 12, 1998: [Home Base School] *Mrs. Perez's students are preparing a Valentine's Day dinner for their mothers. The class is working in small groups on different projects. Some students are in the back room making flowers from tissue paper. A group is making placemats for the tables, using large sheets of construction paper decorated in Valentine motifs, laminated, and cut into rectangles. Each student has already made a sachet for his or her mother. These are cloth bags stuffed with scented cotton and trimmed in lace. Two groups of students are busy making the desserts for the luncheon tomorrow. Mrs. Perez has brought in cooking utensils, a microwave, a convection oven on a cart, cooking supplies, and lots of craft supplies. Tomorrow the students will prepare the meal before their mothers arrive. The menu is appetizers (carrots and celery sticks), spaghetti, bread, tossed salad, and dessert.*

Mrs. Perez reviews the plan for tomorrow. The children will serve their mothers first because "it is polite to serve company first." The boys are reminded to pull out the chairs for their mothers. After lunch, the students will sing the song they have been rehearsing ("The Greatest Love of All" by Whitney Houston), and the teacher will read a story called I'll Love You Forever. After the entertainment, they will have dessert. During dessert, each child will read a book to his or her mother.

Brownies have been mixed up and are cooking in the oven. Mark says, "Man, that chocolate smell good." Mark, Raul, and Catrina are making snickerdoodles. They melted the chocolate in the microwave and are preparing to stir in the crisp Chinese noodles. Mark picks up a stick of butter and says, "My momma need some of this butter, Mrs. Perez." The teacher replies that they also need the butter for the food they are *preparing. Raul walks over with the bowl of melted chocolate in his hands. Mark asks him, "You washed your hands?" He tells Raul to stir with the other hand if one hand gets tired. Catrina is adding the crisp noodles as Raul stirs.*

Smoke starts coming out of the oven door. Mark exclaims, "Look, smoke coming out the ceiling!" Catrina asks the teacher, "Did we burn it?" Mrs. Perez says no, it is just little pieces of batter splashed on the side of the pan that are burning. Still, the smoke is heavy, and the teacher says they will have to do something so the smoke alarms will not be activated. She has the students open the front and back doors to the classroom.

Mark and Catrina take turns holding the bowl while Raul stirs. They comment that the mixture is stiff and hard to stir. Mark and Raul talk about when they will pat the batter down in the pan because they want to lick the spoon and bowl. Catrina doesn't want any. She says, "That looks like black worms."

Mrs. Perez coordinates all of the groups, circulating around the room. The room is humming with purposeful, self-directed activity.

Mrs. Perez calls to the groups that it will soon be lunch time. She says, "We'll have time to sing our song once, and then we'll have to go." She turns on the tape player, and music begins softly. As the music starts, the children are still working in groups around the room. They all start to sing with the music. The song is Whitney Houston's "The Greatest Love of All." The students begin singing the song loudly from wherever they are in the room. They are cooking, drawing, decorating, making things, playing computer games, but they all sing loudly and enthusiastically as they go about their work.

When the song is over, the children begin to clean up from their activity. The teacher asks them to finish up and come to the rug at the front of the room to pick out the book they are going to read to their mothers. The teacher tells me that in this class of 18 students, 13 mothers have said they will attend the luncheon.

March 26, 1998: [Home Base School] *All of the Home Base students are attending breakfast at the Cracker Barrel before going on to a museum. The students are traveling in two shifts. One group of students is leaving the restaurant as we arrive. Mrs. Abbott's class and Mrs. Perez's class are traveling together.*

As the students get off the bus, I notice each one is wearing a name tag on a string around his or her neck. Mrs. Abbott, Mrs. Perez, three teachers' aides, and the school director are traveling with this group of students. Catrina is at the front of the line, holding Mrs. Perez's hand. Jeffery smiles and waves to me as they walk up. Elliott and Hank hug me as they line up.

The restaurant porch has a row of rocking chairs. The front of the building is covered with signs and implements of rural life. Catrina looks around and says, "Look at all those things. Bows and arrows. Look at that big ole knife. Look at them big old chairs." Raul says, "It's antique stuff."

Mrs. Perez has gone in to check with the restaurant hostess who says they are ready for our group. She says, "We've gotten three compliments already. The group before was so wonderful that people were asking what was the name of our school. They said, 'I want my child to go there.'" Mrs. Perez passes on these compliments to the students before they enter the restaurant.

The teachers and aides accompany the children as they snake, one long winding line, through the store and into the restaurant. The store is crowded with all kinds of merchandise--toys, china, gadgets, candy. The children are very careful as they walk through. No one touches anything. They are quiet, talking softly and looking around with interest.

Jeffery has dropped to the end of the line because he stayed behind to hold the door open for everyone. The school director praises him for being a gentleman. George and Andy each hold a door open as a very crippled old woman, almost bent double and leaning on her cane, makes her way slowly through the opening. She thanks them, too, and says, "Have a good time." They respond politely. As we follow the end of the line into the restaurant, a well-dressed African-American man stops the director and asks her, "What school is this? What are the criteria to attend?"

As the children are getting settled, Catrina and Alice are missing their drinks. Tanner and Raul don't have seats. Each student quietly finds a teacher, explains the problem, and waits quietly while it is solved. The children begin eating as soon as they get their food.

Catrina nods to a washboard on the wall and tells Alice and Raul, "That's a washboard. You use it to scrub clothes on." The teachers and director are walking around taking pictures of the students. As Mrs. Perez passes Catrina, Catrina says, "That was good."

Catrina's mother comes in. The aide welcomes her and asks if it was difficult for her to get all the way out to the restaurant. The mother said she had to get her sister to *drive her. Mrs. Perez comes over to visit with Catrina's mother, too. As the children are leaving the store, Catrina's mother stops to buy her a large lollipop. Two students stand by and watch.*

As we are leaving, Elliott holds the door open for several older couples who are entering the restaurant. Each one smiles and says something nice to him. After they have passed by, he looks at me and says, "I got FIVE compliments!" He runs off down the sidewalk and says to his friend, "We got FIVE compliments."

Catrina comes out carrying her big lollipop. Mrs. Perez whispers to Catrina, "That isn't very nice when there isn't enough for everyone." The director, walking with them, says pleasantly, "How about let Mom hold that until later. It will create quite a stir on the bus." Catrina's mother laughs in acknowledgment and puts the lollipop in her purse.

Occasionally, there were class periods when the instructional models were not clearly defined as in the following observation.

February 5, 1998: [Comparison Site] *The students are watching the Walt Disney animated film "Robin Hood." Mrs. Edgeman, the teacher, is sitting at her desk grading papers. Jared, the student I am observing, is sitting off to the side in front of his desk. He appears to be watching the television intently.*

Mrs. Edgeman looks up and calls out, "Whose book report is this? The Littles?" Several students look around, but Jared does not react. Finally he realizes that something is going on. He looks up and raises his hand to claim the paper. Mrs. Edgeman says, "Put your name on it right here." She hands him the paper, he writes his *name and returns it to her, and then goes back to his seat to resume watching the film. A jazzy song comes on called, "The Phony King of England." Jared sways in his seat to the rhythm of the song.*

Mrs. Edgeman continues to grade papers. She looks up if she hears someone whispering and calls them by name, giving directives: "Be quiet. Watch the film. Stop talking." She occasionally asks a student about an assignment. She does not watch the film nor does she comment on it to the students. Other than the occasional monitoring to make sure students stay quiet and one or two clarifications about assignments, there is no interaction between the teacher and the students.

The following excerpt illustrates how teacher-designed materials are used for direct instruction in conjunction with commercially prepared materials.

March 31, 1998: [Home Base School] *Mrs. Perez distributes copies of the TV Guide section of the local newspaper and a worksheet with clock faces. She tells the students to pick a show from the TV Guide for each of the times on the clock faces of their worksheet. Mark grabs a TV Guide. He and Raul discuss what shows are on at different times. As Mrs. Perez walks by, Mark asks her a question. She stops to help him a minute. Catrina also brings her paper up for help from the teacher. Mark asks Mrs. Perez if "All Dogs Go to Heaven" is coming on tonight. She says no, that the TV Guide page is from February. Some students groan with disappointment because they are very excited about picking out favorite TV shows.*

Anna and Raven come over and show me the TV shows they have picked to watch. Mrs. Perez teases them and says they can watch "Barney." They scream "No-o-o-o!" in *mock horror. Raul asks Mrs. Perez where she got the TV guide. She tells him it is in the newspaper every Saturday morning. The other students are talking excitedly with each other about the shows they find.*

Research Question 6: Is there a difference between students at the Home Base School and comparison site schools in their beliefs about their ability to be successful in school?

The participants' perceptions of academic self-efficacy were measured on a survey instrument and also through observation. Survey results were reported in the section of quantitative results. Each observation was analyzed for student behavior related to efficacy. Many students demonstrated confidence through volunteering answers, expressing excitement about trying a task, expressing satisfaction with their work, or helping other students. They also demonstrated a willingness to engage in the assigned task and to work at mastering it. These behaviors were considered to be examples of high academic self-efficacy beliefs.

On the other hand, some students frequently criticized their own work or expressed frustration with the task. They copied work from other students or refused to even attempt the assigned work. These behaviors were considered to indicate low academic self-efficacy. Behaviors related to academic self-efficacy were coded for each observation and tallied by group. The results are indicated in Table 4.23.

Both groups of students exhibited more behaviors indicating high academic self-efficacy than low efficacy behaviors. At the Home Base School, participants exhibited high efficacy behaviors 64% of the time. Low efficacy behaviors were shown 36% of the time. However, the Home Base School participants were unwilling to try a task 25% of the time. At the comparison sites, high efficacy behaviors were seen 56% of the time and low efficacy behaviors were observed 44% of the time. Comparison site participants were unwilling to try a task 39% of the time. It is important to remember that students usually exhibited both types of behaviors, depending on the circumstances. However, high or low efficacy behaviors tended to predominate for each individual.

Table 4.23. Percentages of Participants' Observed Academic Self-Efficacy Behaviors (and Number Observed) by Student Group

Observed Efficacy Behaviors	% Observed at Home Base School (Number Observed) (N^a = 141)	% Observed at Comparison Site Schools (Number Observed) (N^b = 128)
High Efficacy Behaviors		
Demonstrates Confidence	33% (n=47)	36% (n=46)
Willing to Engage in Task	31% (n=44)	20% (n=26)
Low Efficacy Behaviors		
Criticizes Work/Ability	4% (n=5)	2% (n=3)
Unwilling to Try Task	25% (n=35)	39% (n=49)
Copies Work	7% (n=10)	3% (n=4)

[a] Total number of high and low efficacy behaviors observed among Home Base students
[b] Total number of high and low efficacy behaviors observed among comparison site students

The major difference in academic self-efficacy appears to lie in the willingness of students to attempt an academic task. The Home Base School participants were more willing to try an assigned task than were students at the comparison site schools. Home Base School participants were willing to engage in assigned tasks 31% of the time whereas the comparison site participants demonstrated a willingness to engage in an assigned task only 20% of the time.

Teacher Responses to Students

The manner in which a teacher responds to students in a classroom has a great influence on learning environment. When students believe that teachers care about them, they are more likely to aspire to the academic and social goals held by their school (Arhar, 1992).

Each student observation was analyzed to determine the quality of the teacher interaction with students in the class. Positive responses included praising and encouraging, being friendly or accepting towards students, being helpful, and responding in a calm and patient manner. Negative responses included punitive or critical behaviors, unfriendly or ridiculing answers, being unhelpful, or talking to students in a tense and hostile manner. Individual observations were coded by group. The quality of teacher responses for each group is reported in Table 4.24.

Teachers at the Home Base School responded to students positively most of the time (96% of responses). The comparison site teachers had far more negative responses to students (50% of responses) than did teachers at the Home Base School (4% of responses). Obviously, some individual teachers had a preponderance of negative interactions while other individual teachers had predominately positive interactions. It is also important to note that two-thirds (n=10) of the negative interactions reported for the

Home Base School were between an intern and students. At the comparison site schools, 30% of the negative responses to students came from interns and substitute teachers (n=52/172).

Table 4.24. Percentages of Observed Teacher Responses to Students (and Number Observed) by Group

Response	% Observed at Home Base School (Number Observed) (N[a] = 350)	% Observed at Comparison Site Schools (Number Observed) (N[b] = 344)
Positive Responses		
Praising/Encouraging	46% (n=162)	27% (n=93)
Friendly/Accepting	27% (n=94)	13% (n=45)
Calm/Patient	23% (n=79)	10% (n=34)
Negative Responses		
Punitive/Critical	2% (n=8)	30% (n=102)
Unfriendly/Ridiculing	0% (n=0)	12% (n=42)
Tense/Hostile	2% (n=7)	8% (n=28)

[a] Total number of teacher responses to students observed at Home Base School
[b] Total number of teacher responses to students observed at comparison site schools

Examples of Teacher Responses

The following passages, taken from transcripts of daily observations, provide some examples of the nature and range of teacher responses to students which occurred during the study. In this passage, we see how Mrs. Abbott at the Home Base School finds ways to make her students feel special and works to motivate and reward student achievement.

November 18, 1997: *Today Lucy is wearing a vest, as are most of the students in Mrs. Abbott's classroom. The vests are made of difference fabrics and lined on both sides so they are reversible. Each vest has the child's name on it. Mrs. Abbott made the vests. She has decorated them with puff paint. She has created a series of badges with appropriate symbols that students can earn. They get badges for all kinds of on-task, desirable behaviors. When they earn their badges, the teacher paints the symbols on their vests right there in the classroom. When the front is filled, she says she will put badges on the back of their vests so people who see them walking away will know that they are really special and do good work.*

Many teachers at the comparison site schools also worked to motivate and reward student performance.

December 4, 1997: [Comparison Site] *Mrs. Deane begins her math class by calling students to attention with a rhythmic clapping pattern which the students imitate. The teacher changes the rhythmic sequence, pauses, and then the children repeat the sequence. The students become quiet and participate in this activity. The teacher praises* *the work that students have been doing. She says they need to correct a few mistakes and then review. Mrs. Deane writes a number family on the board and asks the students to create two addition and two subtraction problems. Mrs. Deane reads the problems students have written down and then calls on students to provide the answers.*

Mrs. Deane puts smiley faces on students' folders as she walks around the room to reward them for good behavior and exemplary work. Mrs. Deane stops in the middle of the lesson to reward two girls who have filled up their folders with smiley faces. Since the girls each have 50 smiley faces, they get to choose prizes from a box of small toys the teacher keeps in her office. Now Mrs. Deane brings out the box while offering praise for each girl.

The box is filled with erasers, pencils, insects, rings, and other toys. The other students look on with interest as each girl chooses a prize. Mrs. Deane says, "Let's see who's going to sit up straight and tall so you can get more smileys. Okay. Congratulations, winners. Now let's get back to work." Josh, the student I am observing, sits up ramrod straight with his hands folded on the desk as the teacher begins to walk around the room and call on students once again.

Some teachers explicitly instruct students on how to become good students, how to get along with others, and how to build confidence in their own abilities.

February 17, 1998: *Mrs. Abbott is teaching math to a small group of students. David is fussing aloud as he works. Lucy tells the teacher, "I can't do part two." Mrs. Abbott says, "Let's look at it together." She tells the group, "Some people are having trouble with this. Go over it with me." She starts explaining to the group how to set up* *the problem, reviewing the mathematics rules. Several of the students, including Lucy, start to drift off in their attention. Mrs. Abbott says, "It will not be easy if you don't watch. It is your responsibility to watch when the teacher is teaching." The students argue back and forth among themselves. Mrs. Abbott says, "I would like to take you out to a restaurant this year, but we can't go out unless we can talk to each other nicely." As Mrs. Abbott checks Lucy's work. Dupree explains aloud how to do the problems. Mrs. Abbott tells him, "You are so smart." Then she tells Lucy, "Good job. Good job on your homework, too." The teacher encourages various students in the group, saying, "Now you're cooking" as they demonstrate that they know how to do the problems. She says, "Listen a minute. I hear some children arguing [outside of the classroom]. I am so glad you don't sound like that."*

April 2, 1998: *Mrs. Abbott begins by telling the whole class, "I need a sitting-tall class. I was so happy again yesterday, and I have $30 for each of you [in Home Base currency, which can be used for purchases at the school store] for meeting your goals for the day. I have a goal for tomorrow, too." Then she goes on to talk about the way the children eat their breakfasts. She tells the children, "We won't have so many spills if we eat our breakfast this way. Pretend you are doing this." She gives directions on the proper way to eat while the children pantomime her directions.*

Students who do not follow directions and who seem resistant to being taught are encountered in all schools. Students are also frequently rude and cruel to each other. Some teachers made explicit efforts to improve these behaviors. In this passage, we can see how one teacher at the Home Base School attempts to teach her students to follow instructions and behave kindly to each other.

April 24, 1998: *Mrs. Abbott tells the students to come and sit in front of her rocking chair. The rocking chair is a place where the students gather to hear stories, but it is also a place where the teacher gathers students whenever she wants to talk over a problem with them. The teacher says, "We still have two problems, and it is April. One problem is people who do whan they want to do instead of what I ask them to do." Mrs. Abbott names several children and gives specific examples of when they have done what they wanted to do today instead of what she asked them to do. She says, "This is wrong." Then she praises, by name, those students who have done a good job by doing as she asked. She says, "If only half of you do a good job, it makes the class look junky." The students listen attentively. The teacher does not raise her voice or speak in an angry tone. She is simply very serious. She tells the students, "If I gave you a compliment, raise your hand." About half of the students raise their hands. The teacher says, "These are the people who are helping us."*

The teacher continues. "The second problem is that you have chances all day long to be nice to each other. And you say, 'Pattoey!' You have chances all day long to be ugly to each other, and you say, 'Yes!' You are like a class of little alligators." The teacher acts out several interactions between children in the class that have happened today. The teacher uses the example of Lucy and Suzanne, who were crowding each other. Instead of fighting and pushing, they interacted politely. The teacher praises them. She says, "I will watch and listen to see and hear who is doing good. Don't fuss and fight. Show me you *can be nice." The children line up to leave the room. Several children hug the teacher on the way out.*

The following excerpts describe other classroom environments that were warm and accepting for students.

November 17, 1997: [Comparison Site] *The students in Mrs. Hartman's second grade class are doing a series of lessons about birds, reptiles, and amphibians. Yesterday, the students took a cyber-visit to the San Diego Zoo via internet. They were able to see how the zoo got ready for visitors each day, click on the areas of the zoo they wanted to visit, and visit the zoo hospital. Today, the students are working on a cover for their book about reptiles. They have written stories and drawn pictures about each of the animals they have studied. Tomorrow, the class is taking a field trip to a nearby zoo.*

Judy, the student I am observing, is a very quiet child in this classroom. Although Mrs. Hartman tells the students they may use their inside voices to talk with their neighbors while they work, Judy doesn't talk to anyone at her table but goes right to work when she gets her paper. Mrs. Hartman walks around the room, making positive comments about the work she sees. A student asks her, "Will we get in trouble if we mess up?" Mrs. Hartman responds, "Do you ever get in trouble if you mess up in here?" The student says, "No," and smiles. Students also talk to Mrs. Hartman about their work as she walks around. She calls these comments to the class's attention. She says, "Angela, share what you just noticed." Angela explains how she can tell the difference between the crocodile and the alligator by the shape of the animal's mouth. Mrs. Hartman says, "Andrea, share that. That's very good information." Andrea tells the class that lizards *often change color based on their surroundings so the students might want to color the lizard similar to where they think they will place it in the illustration.*

As the teacher walks around, she comments favorably on student work. "Very good. That's the real color of an alligator, too. Some of you are paying very close attention to habitats when you place your animals on your illustration. Very good thinking."

Mrs. Hartman stops by and looks at Judy's work. She says, "I love your turtle." Tyrone, seated at the same table, says, "She colors too dark." Mrs. Hartman replies, "That's okay. That's the way I color, too." Judy does not say anything.

Mrs. Hartman stops by Judy's desk five or six times to compliment her on her work. Judy is having trouble making all of her animals fit on the cover. Mrs. Hartman shows her how to put part of the snake under the tree so it looks like he's wrapped around it. Judy does that. She is one of the first students finished with the project. When she finishes, she sits quietly, talking to no one but admiring her book cover.

As the students finish up, the teacher stands quietly and raises her hand. As each student notices her, they raise their hands and stop talking. A couple of students are slow to notice, but other students whisper their names to get their attention. Mrs. Hartman says, "That's what I love about you. You always help out your neighbors. That's very important to me."

The teacher gives directions about the next activity as the students sit quietly. The students wait quietly until the teacher is finished speaking. Then they move into line as she calls them. She calls the students with a compliment for each one. "Spectacular, Quinta.

Thank you for following directions, Darius. I can see why you were Student of the Week last week, Tommy. Super job." And so it goes, as each student is called up to take his or her place in line. Judy lines up, still without having said a word to any of her classmates.

April 7, 1998: [Comparison site school] *Mrs. Owens teaches a second grade reading class. Today she begins the reading group lesson by praising the students for their good scores yesterday. She calls the name of each student in the group who did well yesterday and rewards each one with a lollipop. She tells the students they may eat their lollipops during the reading lesson but to be sure not to leave any candy wrappers or sticks lying around the room. She tells the group, "It's another day." She encourages the students to do their best and reminds them that they have a chance to win today.*

She tells the group, "Remember, we are tracking." [This means the students are following along the text with their index fingers.] She praises those students who did a good job of tracking yesterday. As they begin the lesson, Mrs. Owens comments on the students' behavior. She says, "Thank you for raising your hand. I like the way Larry is tracking. I need your eyes on your book."

The lesson is scripted. The students read the words aloud in unison. As the students respond in unison, they shout out the words with energy and enthusiasm. Then Mrs. Owens calls upon students to read individually. Janie is called upon to read. She cannot find her place. Mrs. Owens waits patiently for her to find the right place to begin reading.

Next Mrs. Owens calls on Bianca, the student I am observing. Bianca reads very softly. Mrs. Owens asks her to read a little more loudly. Bianca does so, but her voice is still very low and hard to hear..

When students miss a word, Mrs. Owens corrects them. She has the student spell the missed word and repeat it several times before moving on with the lesson. As each student reads a column of words individually, they earn points. Mrs. Owens praises the students for reading so well.

Bianca sits and stares around the room. Most of the students look at their books and point at the words with their fingers. Bianca does not. She leans down so that she is partially hidden behind Alicia. She does not respond with the other students.

After the students read passages from the story aloud, Mrs. Owens questions them about important facts from the text. They are reading about travel. Mrs. Owens has the teacher's aide hold a map and indicate the route from Florida to California. Mrs. Owens asks the students, "What facts did we learn yesterday about miles?" She previews what the students will learn today. She points out each important fact as it occurs in their reading. She says, "What's the rule? Let's repeat it." She questions, "If the toad is going this way, which way is the air moving? Let's go back quickly and review." She asks questions over the main concepts of the text and reminds students of what they already know. She says, "Here's a new rule. You've already seen how this rule works."

Bianca yawns widely. She leans down in her chair and does not answer with the other students. She holds her workbook up in front of her face while Mrs. Owens is giving directions. When Mrs. Owens finishes giving directions, Bianca takes her *workbook and wanders around the classroom. She is one of the last students to sit down and begin working independently.*

Most teachers worked very hard to teach their students academic skills. However, explicit discussion of setting goals and working to achieve them was much rarer. In this excerpt, Mrs. Abbott uses a poem to help her students envision a better future for themselves.

October 23, 1997: [Home Base School] *Mrs. Abbott begins class by having the students recite along with her a poem that she has written for them. She gave me a copy of the poem, which follows.*

There's a Door to the World After Graduation

I've promised myself
I'm going to twelfth;
No sliding back
No getting off-track.
I'm doing things right.
My life looks bright.

I've promised myself
I'm goin' to twelfth;
It's a plain fact,
I know how to act.
I'll do what I should
To make my life good.

I've promised myself
I'm goin' to twelfth;
Nothing more to say,
I'm on my way!
I'll be out the door
To a life of more!

As the teacher recites the poem, the students join in on the parts they remember.

Some classroom observations revealed a negative learning environment. Here are some examples of tension-filled classrooms.

January 8, 1998: [Comparison Site] *Mrs. Kaufman has instructed her third grade students to write a paragraph about how to improve their attitude and behavior in school. She scolds various students as she walks around the room: "Paul, you have a check by your name. Taylor, keep quiet. No one should be talking. Paul, not so loud! Melanie, you're not ready for the other sheet! Tanya, that's a new sharpener. Make sure you don't use it for too long." Mrs. Kaufman looks at some students' papers as they bring them up, but she yells at other students to go sit down. As one boy brings her his paper to check, she says, "You're not next. You stand right back there and close your mouth." The teacher praises those students who did well and gives stickers to students who make 100%. She yells at two boys who are standing up at their desks, "Get in your seat. Have a seat. I said GET IN YOUR SEAT NOW. Let's go. Quickly."*

The animosity students show to each other can be a source of tension in the learning environment.

October 22, 1997: [Comparison Site] *Mrs. Green teaches a third grade reading class. Today an intern is conducting the reading lesson with 10 students over in one corner of the room while Mrs. Green calls students up individually to do their reading check-out tests. The student I am observing, Demetrius, is sitting at his desk with several pre-printed worksheets in front of him. The teacher monitors student behavior from her desk. She calls to various students, "Do your work. Go back to your seat. Be quiet." Demetrius wanders from his desk to the back of the classroom. Mrs. Green directs him* *back to his seat. He wanders all around the room on his way back. He jumps up and down and plays with his pencil. Incomplete worksheets are spread all over his desk. Demetrius works on one sheet for about 30 seconds and then turns to talk to Michael, who is seated behind him. Demetrius calls Michael "a big fat buffalo." Then he reaches out and snatches Michael's paper off his desk. Michael tells Demetrius to "quit playing," but Demetrius continues to antagonize him. He takes Michael's pen, throws it on the floor, and tells Michael to "fetch it." He says to Michael, "Where you get them pencils? You stole 'em, that's what." Michael tries to ignore Demetrius, and finally Demetrius turns back to his own work.*

The reading group is going on right beside Demetrius' desk. He joins in their choral responses to the intern instead of doing his own work. He turns around to Michael again and says, "You need to wash your hair, Pig." He keeps grabbing at papers on Michael's desk while Michael is trying to work. Michael tells Demetrius over and over again to "quit playing." When he can't seem to make Michael angry or distract him from his work, Demetrius turns back to his own desk.

February 16, 1998: [Home Base School] *Eight students are working on their math lesson in the side office, just off the main classroom. Mrs. Abbot is with them, helping individual students. The teacher's aide, Miss Lennon, is working with the other students in the back of the classroom.*

The students are adding money, working with decimals and dollar signs. Several of the students ask Mrs. Abbott for help. David asks her, "Is nine and five fourteen?" She says, "Yes, sir." He tells her, "I got too much numbers. What do you want me to *do?" She leans over his workbook and reviews the process for setting up the problem with him.*

The students working with the aide in the back of the classroom are noisy, and Mrs. Abbott steps out of the math group for a moment to check on them. While she is gone, Andy whines at Dupree, "Stop writing on my erase board." Dupree does not stop. Mrs. Abbott steps back in the room. Andy tattles on Dupree. Mrs. Abbott says to both boys, "Get in your own office." While Mrs. Abbott is working with other students in the room, Dupree leans over and marks on Andy's board again.

Mrs. Abbott steps back into the main classroom momentarily. As soon as she is out of the room, LaKesha says, "Somebody wrote 'Tanner is so fat' on the wall." Andy tells Tanner, "They hate you."

"I don't care," replies Tanner. LaKesha wonders out loud who wrote it. The boys in the group say it must have been Alma. Andy says, "Alma is a fat nugget." LaKesha says, "Who that girl? DeAnn–she did it." Tanner says that DeAnn and Alma are both fat.

Dupree shoots a rubber band at David who then shoots it back at Dupree. Tanner tells them both, "Stop shooting people with rubber bands." Dupree raises his fist and dances around the room. A teacher's aide walks past the door. The students all get quiet and look busy.

Occasionally, teachers responded negatively to a participant in the study, even though their responses to other students in the classroom were positive. Mrs. Edgeman, in the excerpt below, exemplifies this kind of behavior.

April 7, 1998: [Comparison Site] *Mrs. Edgeman teaches an advanced third grade reading class. The first time I observed, she told me that this group was the "creme de la creme" and that they are a year above grade level. She termed Jared, the student I am observing, as "probably gifted, which is surprising considering his background." She says that Jared is very original in his thinking and he hates to follow directions, preferring to do things his own way. Throughout the school year, she has frequently told me that Jared is inconsistent in his schoolwork.*

Today, Mrs. Edgeman has students checking and reporting the number of errors on their workbook and skill pack pages. The students call out the number of errors to her. She writes the number of errors and the grade equivalent for that number on the overhead. Students are to record that grade on the workbook page or skillbook page. After this is done, Mrs. Edgeman says, "As I call your name, tell me your grade so I can record it." She calls on each student individually, who then repeats his or her grade aloud. Mrs. Edgeman does not call on Jared, the student I am observing.

Mrs. Edgeman asks students to indicate how many they missed by raising their hands as she calls out a number. Jared raises his hand indicating he missed six questions. Mrs. Edgeman tells him, "Put down your hand. You don't have a paper."

Most of the grades are 90 and above. Mrs. Edgeman calls on those student who made an A to stand up and take a bow. The class applauds. Jared sits in his desk and does not applaud. As the other students get up to exchange papers, he continues to sit quietly.

While the students are moving around, Mrs. Edgeman comes back to show me Jared's grades. She says he is failing and will be repeating this book again next year, although he can do the work.

As the students exchange workbooks to grade the next section, Mrs. Edgeman calls Jared and tells him to bring his workbook up to her desk. She takes it from him. She has students grade workbooks for absent students as well as the student with whom they exchanged papers. She directs students on what points to check and where to write the correct number of points. As she does this, Jared sits quietly at his desk with nothing to do. The activity they are grading is choosing synonyms. Mrs. Edgeman calls on individual students to read each question and answer it. Then she instructs the entire group to repeat the correct answer, spell it aloud, and repeat it again. During this activity, Mrs. Edgeman reprimands Jared for not paying attention. "I need your eyes," she says. He has no workbook, nothing to look at, nothing to do but sit and listen. While the students spell and repeat the words, Jared sits quietly at his desk, hands over his ears.

Mrs. Edgeman returns Jared's workbook for the next activity. The students are reading aloud. Mrs. Edgeman looks over at Jared, who is sitting quietly in his seat, and says, "You need to be following along. You're not following along. You may put down zero in the WA section of your workbook." Jared makes a soft sound of exasperation.

Students bring their fears, illnesses, and insecurities to school with them. Thoughtful teachers who wish to create a positive learning environment acknowledge these issues. Failure to take these issues into account may interfere with a student's focus on learning.

March 19, 1998. [Home Base School] *It is a cloudy, rainy day outside. In the middle of the lesson, Aaron interrupts. "Mrs. Perez, what if we get a hurricane right here?" The teacher stops and explains how hurricanes feed on water and lose their steam when they get over land. She tells Aaron, "We're in the middle of the state so we don't have so much risk of hurricanes." She continues with the lesson. A few minutes later, Aaron interrupts again. "But what if we get a tornado?" The teacher says calmly, "Well, sometimes we do get tornadoes here." He seems satisfied with her answer.*

After the group lesson, students are working on individual assignments. Aaron comes over to Mrs. Perez. He has broken the pencil lead off in his hand. Mrs. Perez takes him over to the sink and washes his hand. She says that pencil leads can be dangerous. She asks me to watch the class briefly while she takes Aaron up to the school nurse. Aaron starts to fuss and whine. He is afraid the nurse will give him a shot, and he doesn't want one. Mrs. Perez reassures him as they go out. In a few minutes, they come back. The nurse has said that it's okay. (Something about the way pencil leads are made these days makes them safer.) Mrs. Perez brings Aaron back to the sink and "operates" to get the lead out. Afterwards, she tells him to play in the water and make lots of bubbles with the soap to make sure he gets his hands really clean. He makes lots of suds and splashes around. Then he calls other students over to see his suds.

February 17, 1998: [Home Base School] *Brian comes up to Mrs. Perez and points to his mouth. She asks him, "Did your tooth come out?" He nods, "Yes." The teacher says, "That's always so exciting, Brian. Keep rinsing your mouth out." He does so for awhile, then he walks around the room, showing his friends where he lost a tooth.*

Brian walks around rubbing his gum and complaining that it hurts. The teacher gives him a hug.

January 15, 1998: [Comparison Site] *Mrs. Green is conducting a reading lesson with most of the class. Demetrius is playing with a stack of blocks at his desk, ignoring her. He does not even open his reading book until the group has finished with the first column of words. He does not respond in unison with the group. Mrs. Green says, "Not everyone is participating."*

Demetrius drags out his backpack and takes out a chain. He plays with the chain and his pencil as the other students read. Mrs. Green calls on Demetrius to read. He reads his column of words without error and then resumes playing with the chain and pencil. Mrs. Green calls on him again. He cannot find his place, so he loses his turn. Mrs. Green takes the chain and the blocks away from him. She tells him, "Keep up." The other students take turns reading. Demetrius knocks his book to the floor while Rebecca is reading. Mrs. Green does not comment on his behavior. Demetrius stands up. He is the only student out of his seat. Mrs. Green says, "Demetrius, please sit down." He does, but he finds another block and begins to play with it. He beats on the desk while the teacher is talking. She does not comment.

The teacher has finished the reading lesson and assigns students pages to do in their workbooks. Demetrius yells in disgust, "Man, why we gotta do this?" He frowns and slams his pencil on the desk. Mrs. Green reprimands him. Mrs. Green is giving directions, but Demetrius continues to play. He flips his block over two rows of students to the front of the room. Then he gets up and picks up the block. The teacher is still *giving directions. She does not comment on his behavior. Demetrius gets up and walks to the back of the room. He complains to Tyler about his tooth. Tyler says, "Take it out." Demetrius goes into the bathroom at the back of the classroom. The teacher continues with her instruction. Demetrius comes out of the bathroom and shows Tyler his tooth. He plays with some things on Tyler's desk. Mrs. Green looks up and tells Demetrius to sit down. He says, "My tooth bleeding." Mrs. Green does not respond to him. James asks Demetrius if he got something stuck in his tooth. After a few more minutes, Demetrius calls out to the teacher again. She does not respond to him. He goes up to her and says, "My tooth bleeding." She looks and gives him some tissue without comment.*

Quality of Teacher Discipline

The nature of discipline in the classroom is integral to establishing a positive learning environment. Each observation was analyzed for the nature of disciplinary action that took place during that instructional period. Positive disciplinary measures included setting clear standards and modeling appropriate behavior, praising desirable behavior when it occurred, and correcting inappropriate behavior effectively. For example, teachers who clearly stated rules and consistently enforced them and who spoke to students in a polite and respectful manner were considered to set clear standards and model appropriate behavior. Effective correction of inappropriate behavior might be telling the student what desirable behavior to do or instructing student to stop the undesirable behavior in a calm and brief manner. Teachers also exercised positive discipline by explaining the rationale behind the rules, asking students to assess their own behavior, and giving students input into creating rules for the classroom.

Negative disciplinary procedures included having ambiguous standards or modeling poor behavior. Teachers who enforced rules inconsistently, punishing some students and allowing other students to behave the same way with impunity, exhibited ambiguous behavioral standards. Teachers also set poor behavioral models when they yelled at students, spoke to them in a hostile or unfriendly manner, or used sarcasm and ridicule to embarrass students. Other negative disciplinary procedures included ignoring student misbehavior, correcting behavior ineffectively (for example, by making threats that were never enacted), depriving a student of instruction as a punishment, lowering grades as a punishment for inappropriate behavior, or allowing disciplinary action to supplant or subvert the instructional time.

After each observation was analyzed for disciplinary actions, the frequency of observations were counted by group. The frequency of responses for each group and percentages are reported in Table 4.25.

Teachers at the Home Base School portrayed many more effective (93%, or n=170) than ineffective (7%, or n=12) disciplinary responses. Teachers at the comparison sites also displayed more effective responses (60%, or n=134) than ineffective responses (40%, or n=88), but the ineffective disciplinary responses constituted a much higher percentage of total responses.

Table 4.25. Frequency (and Total Number) of Observed Teacher Disciplinary Actions by Group

Disciplinary Action	Number of Disciplinary Actions Observed at Home Base School (N=182)	Number of Disciplinary Actions Observed at Comparison Site Schools (N=222)
Effective Disciplinary Actions		
Has Clear Standards/Models Appropriate Behavior	51	16
Praises Desirable Behavior	17	26
Corrects Inappropriate Behavior Effectively	66	90
Explains Rationale for Rules	12	0
Asks Ss to Assess Own Behavior	14	1
Gives Ss Choices/Input into Rules	10	I
Ineffective Disciplinary Actions		
Has Ambiguous Standards/Models Inappropriate Behavior	1	9
Ignores Ss Misbehavior	0	6
Corrects Inappropriate Behavior Ineffectively	5	37
Deprives Ss of Instruction	5	23
Lowers Grades for Disciplinary Purposes	0	2
Allows Disciplinary Action to Supplant Instruction	I	11

Note: Number of observed actions are shown rather than percentages. Percentages for positive and negative disciplinary actions are reported within the text.

It should be noted that of the ineffective disciplinary responses at the Home Base School, almost half of them (42%, or n=5) were attributed to an intern. No daily substitutes were observed at Home Base School. Of the ineffective responses at the comparison site schools, 36% (n=32) were attributed to interns and substitute teachers. These figures are included as part of the total because intern and substitute behaviors also contribute to the students' perception of learning environment.

Examples of Teacher Disciplinary Practices

The best way to understand the quality of discipline in various classrooms is through examples. Excerpts from classroom observations have been used to illustrate the nature of disciplinary practices seen in the classrooms at both the Home Base School and the comparison site schools. In the following passage, Mrs. Abbott of the Home Base School uses a combination of praise, student self-assessment, and student input to foster good behavior.

October 13, 1997: [Home Base School] *Mrs. Abbott teaches a combined first and second grade classroom. Today she is leading a reading group. As she goes through the lesson, she praises and affirms both good reading and good behavior. She directs the behavior she wants from the students. She says to them, "Check yourself. Are you sitting correctly? Touch your ear if you are being a good listener." The students in this group seem tired. It is the first reading group of the day. They ask to stop and take a rest. The teacher stops the lesson momentarily, and they all sing the Home Base song (a song* *written by the teachers which affirms the values of the school—a sense of belonging and a willingness to try hard). Then they go back to work.*

Occasionally teachers give students input into creating the rules for behavior in the classroom. Here is an example of how one teacher solicited student input.

October 30, 1997: [Home Base School] *This is a temporary teacher, Mrs. Towne, who will be here for several weeks until a permanent teacher is hired. Mrs. Towne is teaching a second/third grade combination class with students who have been pulled from Mrs. Abbott's class and Mr. Blake's class.*

Mrs. Towne talks to the group of students about her plans and expectations. She says that she will always treat them with kindness and respect and she wants them to treat her and each other in the same way. Mrs. Towne says, "That's what I will do. What will you do?" Catrina says, "The same thing." Mrs. Towne asks the students, "What kind of rules do you think we need for our class? I have some ideas, and I'd like to hear your ideas, too." Aaron suggests "Follow the rules" as a class rule. The teacher responds positively. Mrs. Towne proposes some scenarios. She gives the students some examples of conflicts that might arise on the playground or in class. She asks, "If someone accidentally pushes you or bumps into you or knocks something off your desk, what would you do?" Carl suggests, "If you are the one who bumped the other person, you should pick up the stuff and say you're sorry." Aaron says, "Tell the person 'I do not like that. Will you please stop?'" Mrs. Towne talks about some right ways and wrong ways to handle conflict. She asks the students how they will handle situations when they may be having a bad day and feeling mad. Catrina says, "I want to say something." The teacher *gives her permission. Catrina says, "Katy always has a bad day." Mrs. Towne asks, "What are you going to do if that happens?" She helps Catrina think of some better ways to handle conflict. The teacher recaps the rules they have discussed so far: Treat others as you would like to be treated. Catrina says, "That's the Golden Rule." Mrs. Towne affirms her answer. Other students began to suggest rules. They suggest things like: "Keep our hands and feet to ourselves. No hitting. Just be kind. Take a deep breath." Catrina says they shouldn't make fun of handicapped people and tells them about her cousin Jeb who is handicapped and can't walk. Mrs. Towne asks Catrina if there are some ways she can still play with Jeb and suggests that Catrina might read to him. Catrina says that Mrs. Abbott would let them take books home from school to read if they were careful with them. She wants to know if Mrs. Towne will do the same. Mrs. Towne assures her that she will bring in plenty of books that the students can take home.*

Student misbehavior can be handled in a positive manner which helps students learn to take responsibility for themselves. In this observation, Mrs. Perez uses positive disciplinary techniques to bring her class to order.

January 22, 1998: [Home Base School] *Mrs. Perez took over this combined class of second and third graders in early December. Today, the students have been finishing some seatwork. Many have been working at centers around the room. Mark is carrying the class pet, an iguana named Power Tail, around the room. Elliott asks me if I would like to play Checkers with him. I tell him I would love to, but I must write because that is my schoolwork. The aide suggests to Elliott that Catrina might like to play; the two children go back to the Checkers table and begin a game. Carl brings a plastic snake* *over to me and shows me how he makes it jump. It makes me jump, too, and he laughs. Mark puts Power Tail on his head and walks over, asking me if I like his hat. Now Alice is playing Checkers with Elliott. Catrina is sitting at her desk. Brad brings a book about iguanas over to Catrina's desk and several students gather around to look at it.*

Mrs. Perez is ready for the class to move on to another activity. She is trying to get their attention. She turns off the lights as a signal to sit quietly. Gradually, the students begin to settle down and get quiet. She fills the time while they are moving to their seats with praise and direction. She says, "Thank you, Carl, for going right to your seat. Let's clean up. Raven knows how to follow directions. Thank you for sitting quietly. Brad's ready. Alice is ready. You do such a good job when you get to work, but it's rude to keep talking when others are talking. It's my turn right now." Very gradually, the noise begins to quiet. She says, "I'm still waiting for everyone to be polite. Let's all put our hands on our desks so I can be sure everyone is doing what they are supposed to be doing."

Pre-service teachers (interns and pre-interns) often exhibited very weak classroom management skills. Frequently, they precipitated the negative behavior which occurred because of their attempts to control children rather than help children learn to control themselves.

November 20, 1997: [Home Base School] *Mrs. Abbott divides the class into two reading groups. An intern, Miss Kincaid, is taking the first group while Mrs. Abbott teaches the second group at the back of the classroom. Tanner, the student I am observing, is in Miss Kincaid's group. Tanner goes over and sits down on the bench at* *the reading table. All of the girls crowd onto the bench with him. They do not want to sit by Andy. Miss Kincaid comes over to the group and immediately tells LaKesha and Katy, two of the girls on the bench, to move. LaKesha argues with Miss Kincaid and tells her they have assigned seats and that is where they are supposed to sit. Miss Kincaid argues back and tells LaKesha five or six times to move. LaKesha refuses. Miss Kincaid takes LaKesha by the arm and pulls her from the bench and puts her into a chair. LaKesha attempts to move back to her seat on the bench. All of the girls, especially LaKesha and Katy, are arguing with Miss Kincaid. Tanner, one of two boys in the group, keeps quiet. He just sits patiently, waiting for the group to begin. Then Miss Kincaid tells Katy to move. Katy ignores her. Miss Kincaid tells Katy four or five times to move. Katy does not respond. Miss Kincaid takes Katy by the arm and drags her outside. Katy says she doesn't want to sit by "ugly ole Andy." Mrs. Abbott comes over to the group and temporarily restores calm. She places the students at the table. The teacher tells the group to all take a deep breath. She says gently, "We can make this good or bad. Now what's important here?" The children calm down momentarily and Mrs. Abbott goes back to the other reading group. Miss Kincaid takes over. Katy and LaKesha are pouting and refuse to participate in the lesson. Tanner is ready when Miss Kincaid begins. He is the only student in the group who isn't fussing with someone. Miss Kincaid begins the lesson. Tanner reaches over to help her hold the book, which is large and has a tendency to fall. As soon as Miss Kincaid begins, LaKesha tries to tell her how Mrs. Abbott does the lesson. Miss Kincaid tries unsuccessfully to get the lesson started. LaKesha says, "I can't see the book." Miss Kincaid does not respond to her. LaKesha* *asks her, "Will you stop for a minute while I tie my shoe?" Miss Kincaid replies, "You are supposed to get dressed at home." LaKesha fidgets and mutters. Tanner is the only student paying attention to the intern. He asks Miss Kincaid if he can read all the words by himself. She replies, "Sit up straight and put your back against the wall." Miss Kincaid calls Bethany to attention by saying, "Earth to Bethany." The students laugh and begin to mimic her. Miss Kincaid asks Lucy, Bethany, and Ginger, "What's the problem?" Bethany replies, "None of your business." LaKesha and Ginger start quarreling with each other. Miss Kincaid is threatening to call everyone's mother. She tells Bethany to leave the group and go to time out. Bethany crawls under the table instead. Miss Kincaid tries to go on with the lesson. Bethany yells loudly from under the table. She yells loudly again. Miss Kincaid again threatens to call the mothers of Lucy, LaKesha, Ginger, and Andy, who are all arguing. LaKesha argues with Miss Kincaid and says she can't reach her Granny who is at work. Miss Kincaid says she will stay up until midnight if necessary to reach their mothers. Bethany is still under the table. Mrs. Abbott comes over and tells Bethany firmly but kindly to come out from under the table. She takes Bethany away. Miss Kincaid gets in another argument with Lucy because Lucy is not sitting up straight. Then time is up for the reading lesson.*

In the following observation, the intern's interactions with the participant seem to result in the participant's discouragement rather than motivation.

October 14, 1997: [Comparison Site] *Mackie Taylor is a student in Mrs. Jameson's third grade language arts class. Today the lesson is being taught by an intern,* *Miss Samson. Miss Samson is demonstrating how to write a paragraph as she talks through a topic and writes sentences on the board.*

When she has finished her paragraph, she reads it to the class. Then students are asked to look at the clusters they have previously created and write their own paragraph, using a topic sentence and supporting details.

After the students begin writing at their desks, Mackie brings his paper up to Miss Samson to show her his work. She reprimands him for being out of his seat and refuses to look at the paper. She says he is to raise his hand and she will come to his desk, which she does. When she gets to his desk, she reprimands him for writing during the lesson and for not having enough details in his paper. She tells him to rewrite the paper. Mackie sits and stares into space. He folds his paper into quarters and mutters to the boy next to him, "I was finished with this." Miss Samson stops by Mackie's desk again to re-direct him to his work. After she leaves, he continues complaining to the boy next to him that Miss Samson is making him do the paper over. Mrs. Jameson comes over and speaks to Mackie, encouraging him to begin writing. He writes for 30-40 seconds. Then he begins to tap his throat, making a loud popping sound. All of the other students are working quietly. He is the only student making noise. Miss Samson looks up at him, but she does not comment on his behavior. He continues to make this noise for several minutes. He does not write. Most of the students are finishing their papers and bringing them up to the intern or to Mrs. Jameson. Mackie sits and plays. He does not get the assignment done at all.

Substitute teachers frequently experienced many discipline problems in the classroom, as shown in the following observations.

January 13, 1998: [Comparison Site] *The regular teacher, Mrs. Lattimer, has had several substitutes recently. Today the substitute is a young man who has been with the class often enough to learn the students' names. When I come in, five or six boys are running around the classroom. The substitute stands in the middle of the room shouting instructions for the students to sit down, be quiet, and do their work. The students are supposed to be completing worksheets to plot degrees centigrade and Fahrenheit. Several of the students do not appear to understand how to do the task. The substitute is walking around trying to help students who raise their hands. Many of the students are shouting and yelling. Rachel, the student I am observing, is one of the few students who are seated and working quietly.*

The substitute keeps up a running commentary of admonitions: "Sit down. Stop yelling. Deion, in your seat. If you're talking when I'm talking, you're being rude. Hands up, zero noise. Deion, you're not paying attention. Corey, you're not paying attention." Nothing the substitute says makes any difference in the noise level or chaos in the room. Most of the boys in the class are running around the room.

The boy in front of Rachel yells out, "I don't know how to spell 'journal'." Rachel spells it for him. She leans across the table and watches his paper as he writes. Deion yells at Corey and Dimitri, "It is too a hot day!" The three boys argue loudly about the weather. Rachel brings her work over to show it to the substitute. He tells her, "Excellent." She goes quietly back to her seat.

The substitute scolds Deion and Dimitri for running. Deion yells back at the substitute. The substitute threatens both of them with a visit to the principal's office. Deion continues yelling, so the substitute takes him out of the room. Corey crawls under the table. As Deion is leaving, the substitute says, "One down." Corey adds, "And 22 to go."

February 10, 1998: [Comparison Site] *Mrs. Lattimer is not coming back this year. Today the substitute is a young woman. Before class begins, Rachel walks up to the substitute and says, "Guess what. Mrs. Harris is going to sub us on Monday." The substitute does not respond to Rachel's comment.*

The class begins with the substitute scolding Deion. She tells him loudly, "You will miss one dollar off payday this week." [Some of the schools use play money as a local currency to reward students. This school calls their money Cool Cash.] Deion yells at her, "I didn't do nuthin!" He continues to fidget in his seat and bang his books on the desk loudly as she tries to get the class settled.

She tells the group they are going to write a paragraph. Many students groan loudly. Comments like, "Why do we have to write? I hate to write!" are heard throughout the classroom. The substitute says, "Many of you are missing writing grades from yesterday. You need to complete your papers and turn them in to get a grade." The students continue to fuss. "Why do we have to write?" they complain. The substitute replies, "We have to write every day because it is a requirement. That's why."

The students must write at least four sentences, she says. The topic she assigns is "Why I Am Special." That creates another loud outburst. Johnny yells, "I ain't special. I *ain't good at nothing. I'm stupid." Other boys yell variations of the same thing: "I ain't special; ain't nothing special about me." The substitute says repeatedly, "Everybody's special in some way," but the boys keep saying that they don't want to write about the topic. Finally she tells them to make something up if they don't know anything special about themselves. The substitute moves over to work with individual students. She coaches them by asking, "Tell me something you are good at. Tell me something you like."*

Rachel sits quietly at her desk. She says aloud, to no one in particular, "I need a pencil." She goes to the teacher's desk and take a pencil from the cup, then returns to her seat and begins working.

Johnny remains off task, even when the other students have settled down. The aide tells him, "Mark a dollar off right there." There are several other threats issued from the substitute and the aide about people losing Cool Cash. However, no money is picked up and no records are made of these comments. Rachel gets up from her desk and walks to the back table where she picks up her bag of Cool Cash and takes it back to her desk.

The aide brings Johnny, who is still not working on the writing topic, to the back table. She says, "Sit right here and do your work. I want your name right here on the top." Johnny sticks out his bottom lip and says, "I don't want to do this." The aide replies, "Come on. Hurry up." Johnny says, "I'm not special." Finally, the aide tells him to write why he is not special. He still refuses to work. She gives him a choice of writing the paper or going to the principal. After a few moments, he says, begrudgingly, that he will do it. He writes his name at the top of his paper and does nothing else. The *substitute turns on the television set and tells the children to watch it while they are writing. Many students stop writing–some to watch TV and others to talk to their friends. Rachel turns in a paper. I do not see any other student do so.*

February 24, 1998: [Comparison Site] *A substitute is with this second grade class again today.*

The substitute, Miss Bernard, tells the students to have a seat on the floor. About half of them do so. The other half stand around the room or sit at their desks. Miss Bernard keeps asking the students to sit down. As she deals with the off-task students one by one, the other students begin to comply. Those students who will not obey are sent to various corners of the room to stand with their noses to the wall.

Judy, the student I am observing, and Melinda are seated up against the wall talking with each other, half hidden by a cart. Miss Bernard pulls Corin out of the group and says he was talking. She makes him go stand in a corner. Corin argues with her. He says, "I wasn't talking. It was Judy and that bleached blonde, Melinda." Miss Bernard doesn't respond to him. At this point, there are five children in various corners of the room, 11 minutes have passed, and many students are still up and walking around the room.

Miss Bernard gets the students quieted down. Then she says, "Well, you have wasted 11 minutes. Where would you like to take the 11 minutes from? Shall we take it from lunch? From recess? From the art exhibit?" Students began to shout their displeasure. Miss Bernard gets them quiet again. She says, "You have now wasted 15 minutes. This is a ridiculous amount of time." She holds up a story book, King

Bidgood's in the Bathtub and He Won't come Out and begins to read it to the students. Judy and Melinda have continued to sit and talk. They remain off-task.

Miss Bernard reads a few sentences of the story and interrupts to discipline a student. She interrupts herself several more times to reprimand students before continuing the story. Judy sits and makes faces, ties and unties her shoes, and looks around at the other students. Miss Bernard stops to ask the students some questions about the story. Most of the students are eager to answer, but Judy shows no interest.

When students fail to achieve or when they behave badly, teachers often become frustrated. This frustration can cause teachers to be reactive in dealing with student behavior. Here are two examples.

January 29, 1998: [Comparison Site] *Mrs. Green teaches a third grade reading class. This morning, she has Demetrius standing up by her desk in front of the entire class. She is scolding him loudly. She says, "I am responsible for sending you on to fourth grade. You are making a bad choice. You were supposed to develop good work habits before Christmas. January is over. Next week it will be February. You are running out of time. You are supposed to develop good work habits, but you blew it. If I have to send you to time out every day, you won't stay here. Your parents will know you are making bad choices." Demetrius stands quietly at her desk, not protesting or responding to her in any way, as she continues scolding him. When she has finished talking to him, she sends Demetrius to the Behavioral Resource Teacher who handles discipline referrals at this school.*

April 23, 1998: [Comparison Site] *Mackie is one of the last students to come into the classroom. A few months ago, his custodial parent was killed in an accident. He is now living with his other parent. As Mackie comes into class, he threatens one of his classmates with a rubber band while he is getting settled at the table. Mrs. Jameson asks him, "Mackie, what are you supposed to be doing?" He replies, "Doing the DOL [Daily Oral Language], which I can't read." Mrs. Jameson says, "Well, you've read it for three days." Mrs. Jameson goes over to help another student. Mackie continues to sit and do nothing. He has no pencil. He reaches over to the marker board and takes a piece of chalk and tries to write with it on his paper. The teacher reaches over and takes the piece of chalk away from him. She says, "I expect you to be working." He doesn't begin his work. Mrs. Jameson begins to review the lesson. Mackie continues to play with the rubber band. She holds out her hand for it. He protests, "It's mine!" but as she continues to hold out her hand, he gives it to her. He continues to play at his desk and make noises.*

The students begin to work individually on their assignment. Johan says Mackie stole his pencil. Mackie denies it vehemently, although now he has a pencil whereas he did not have one before. Mrs. Jameson moves Mackie to another seat. He argues with her and refuses to move at first. He is playing with his hat. The teacher tells him to give the hat to her. He throws it at her and pushes the desk backwards. The teacher moves his desk and makes him face the wall. Mackie pulls his sweatshirt over his head and hums loudly. The other students are doing their work. Mrs. Jameson stops by his desk and tells him softly that he will need to "get it together or go up front" to the office. He argues *loudly with her. He says it was a lie, that he did not steal Johan's pencil. Mrs. Jameson gives Mackie an English book to start his lesson. He slams it down on the desk. Mrs. Jameson quietly tells him he will have to leave the classroom. She accompanies him to the door. He stomps out down the hall. He has done no classwork so far.*

After a few moments, Mackie comes back into the classroom. Mrs. Jameson makes him sit off by himself. He hides down behind the counter at the front of the room. She snaps her fingers at him and points to a book. He ducks down behind the counter again. A tutor comes into the room to work with one of the students. As he passes, he kneels down behind the counter to speak to Mackie. Mackie is hiding in the corner. Mrs. Jameson goes over to Mackie and sends him out of the room again. This time, she writes a discipline referral and a list of assignments that he has not completed. Then she escorts him down the hall to the Behavioral Resource Teacher's office.

Teacher and Participant Interactions

The final dimension of the learning environment which was studied addressed the interaction between the teacher and the participant under observation as well as the interaction between the participant and his/her peers. Four subcategories of interactions were examined: (a) the nature of the teacher's responses to the student; (b) the nature of the student's responses to the teacher; (c) the nature of the student's interaction with his or her peers; and (d) the student's level of affiliation with school.

Teacher-to-Participant Interaction

The teacher-to-participant responses were coded along several behaviors. First, teacher responses to a student could be acknowledging or unacknowledging. This judgment pertained to whether or not the teacher responded to the student at all. A teacher could acknowledge the student in a positive or negative manner, or the teacher could ignore the student (unacknowledging). Then responses were designated as supportive or unsupportive. If a teacher acknowledged a student in a positive, friendly, accepting manner, that response was considered to be supportive. If, however, the teacher acknowledged the student in a punitive, hostile, or critical manner, that response was considered unsupportive. Finally, some responses were considered to be nurturing because they exhibited increased individual attention and care to students in need. Each observation was analyzed and coded for teacher responses to the student under observation. Each exchange between the teacher and student was noted. Then responses were tallied by group. Table 4.26 indicates the responses by teachers in each group to the students under observation.

Responses that were acknowledging, supportive, and/or nurturing were rated as positive interactions. Negative interactions were those which were unacknowledging or unsupportive. The teachers at the Home Base School exhibited positive interactions with the participants 92% of the time (n = 237). Only 8% of their interactions with these students were negative (n = 20). Teachers at the comparison sites exhibited positive interactions with the participants 60% of the time (n = 183) and negative interactions 40% of the time (n = 122). These figures are very similar to the positive and negative teacher responses to the entire group.

Table 4.26. Frequency (and Total Number) of ObservedTeacher Responses to Participants by Group

Teacher Response	Frequency of Teacher Responses at Home Base School (N=257)	Frequency of Teacher Responses at Comparison Site Schools (N=305)
Positive Responses		
Acknowledging	112	101
Supportive	98	75
Nurturing	27	7
Negative Responses		
Unacknowledging	12	37
Unsupportive	8	85

Note: Number of observed teacher responses are given. Percentages for total positive and negative responses observed are reported within the text.

Participant-to-Teacher Interaction

Participants reacted to teachers in many ways but all of those ways could be condensed into two categories: (a) seeking positive attention from the teacher; or (b) seeking negative attention from the teacher. Seeking positive attention included obeying instructions, listening politely, responding when appropriate, showing friendliness toward the teacher, and generally being helpful and cooperative. Seeking negative attention included disobedience, ignoring teacher instructions or requests, and generally unfriendly or uncooperative behaviors.

Each observation was analyzed and coded using these categories to indicate the participant's responses to the teacher. Each response was noted. Then the participants' responses were tallied by group. Table 4.27 reports the totals for types of participant-to-teacher interactions by student group.

Table 4.27. Percentages of Observed Participant-to-Teacher Interactions (and Number Observed) by Student Group

Interaction	% Observed at Home Base School (Number Observed) (N[a] = 141)	% Observed at Comparison Site Schools (Number Observed) (N[b] = 144)
Seeks positive attention from teacher	74% (n=104)	35% (n=50)
Seeks negative attention from teacher	26% (n=37)	65% (n=94)

[a] Total observed participant-to-teacher interactions at Home Base School
[b] Total observed participant-to-teacher interactions at comparison site schools

Participants at the Home Base School responded positively to their teachers more often than did participants at the comparison site schools. At the Home Base School, 74% of participant responses to their teachers were positive (n = 104), while participants at the comparison sites responded positively to their teachers 35% of the time (n = 50).

Participants at the comparison site schools responded negatively to their teachers 65% of the time (n = 94) compared with 26% negative responses from the Home Base School participants (n = 37).

Participant-to-Peer Interaction

The social interactions between the student under observation and his/her peers were recorded, analyzed, and coded. Peer interaction behaviors were assigned to the following categories: (a) student is part of a group; (b) student is friendly and helpful to others; (c) student is isolated from the group; and (d) student is aggressive/obstructive towards others. Being part of a group and exhibiting friendly, helpful behaviors were considered as positive interactions with peers while being isolated, aggressive, or obstructive were considered as negative peer interactions. Each observation was analyzed and coded for these interactions and then tallied by student group. Table 4.28 indicates the totals of the observed behaviors by student group.

Participants at the Home Base School exhibited more positive social interactions with their peers (42%, or n=60) than did participants at the comparison sites (30%, or n=34). However, students in both groups exhibited more negative social interactions than positive ones. Peer interactions were negative 58% (n=86) of the time at the Home Base School and 70% (n= 78) of the time at the comparison site schools.

Table 4.28. Percentages of Observed Participant-to-Peer Interactions (and Number Observed) by Student Group

Interaction	% Observed at Home Base School (Number Observed) (N[a] = 146)	% Observed at Comparison Site Schools (Number Observed) (N[b] = 112)
Positive Interactions		
Part of a Group	19% (n=26)	18% (n=20)
Helpful/Friendly	23% (n=34)	12% (n=14)
Negative Interactions		
Isolated	16% (n=24)	33% (n=37)
Aggressive/Obstructive	42% (n=62)	37% (n=41)

[a] Total participant-to-peer interactions observed at Home Base School
[b] Total participant-to-peer interactions observed at comparison site schools

Research Question 7: Is there a difference between students at the Home Base School and comparison site schools in their sense of school affiliation?

The extent to which participants demonstrated a sense of belonging and acceptance at school was judged through classroom observations and through the student interviews. Each observation was analyzed, and student behavior related to affiliation was categorized. Positive categories included the following: (a) supports or enforces classroom rules; (b) enjoys and participates in classroom activities; (c) interacts positively with peers; and (d) seeks out the teacher. Negative categories included (a) rejects classroom rules; (b) dislikes or refuses to participate in classroom activities; (c) has little peer interaction or negative peer interaction; and (d) avoids or ignores the teacher. Once again, individual student responses were totaled by group. The results of these totals are reported in Table 4.29.

The first set of four observed behaviors (supporting classroom rules, participating in activities, interacting positively with peers, and seeking out the teacher) were all considered to be evidence of a strong sense of affiliation. This kind of behavior suggested that the student had a sense of belonging and purpose connected with his or her school experiences. The second set of four observed behaviors (rejecting classroom rules, lack of participation in learning activities, little interaction or negative interaction with peers, and avoiding or ignoring the teacher) were considered to be evidence of weak school affiliation. Arhar (1992) suggested that students who exhibit weak school affiliation may already be in the process of disengaging from school.

Students at the Home Base School exhibited behaviors indicating a strong school affiliation behaviors 80% (n=146) of the time and a weak school affiliation behaviors 20% (n=37) of the time. Students at the comparison sites exhibited strong affiliation behaviors only 43% (n=66) of the time and weak school affiliation behaviors 57% (n=90) of the time.

Table 4. 29. Percentages of Observed School Affiliation Behaviors (and Number Observed) by Student Group

Affiliation Behavior	% Observed at Home Base School (Number Observed) ($\underline{N}^a$ = 183)	% Observed at Comparison Site Schools (Number Observed) ($\underline{N}^b$ = 156)
Strong Affiliation		
Supports Classroom Rules	5% (n=9)	2% (n=3)
Enjoys/Participates in Activities	37% (n=67)	24% (n=37)
Interacts Positively with Peers	17% (n=32)	10% (n=15)
Seeks Out Teacher	21% (n=38)	7% (n=11)
Weak Affiliation		
Rejects Classroom Rules	0% (n=0)	4% (n=6)
Dislikes/Refuses to Participate in Activities	3% (n=6)	17% (n=27)
Little Peer Interaction or Negative Interactions	17% (n=31)	22% (n=34)
Avoids/Ignores Teacher	0% (n=0)	14% (n=23)

[a] Total of participants' school affiliation behaviors observed at Home Base School
[b] Total of participants' school affiliation behaviors observed at comparison site schools

A student interview was given to also assess the student's feelings of school affiliation (see Appendix D). Each interview was analyzed and coded. Each type of response was coded only once per interview. The following list of questions was used to guide the coding.

1. Did the student express positive or negative feelings about coming to school?
2. Did the student indicate a liking for or a dislike of academic and/or social activities at school?
3. Did the student express academic and/or personal goals held by the student or by the teacher on the student's behalf?
4. Did the student indicate that he/she had friends at school or did he/she express a sense of isolation?
5. Did the student express a positive or negative view of the teacher?
6. Did the student perceive the academic environment in his/her classroom to be supportive or unsupportive?
7. What changes, if any, did the student wish to see in his/her school: (a) no change; (b) better behaved students; (c) more student choice; (d) improved facilities; or (e) self-improvement?

Student responses to the interview questions were totaled by student group. The results are reported in Table 4.30.

Table 4.30. Frequency of School Affiliation Interview Responses (and Number of Students Responding) by Student Group

Student Response	Frequency of Responses at Home Base School (N[a]=10)	Frequency of Responses at Comparison Site Schools (N[b]=9)
School Attendance		
Likes attending school	10	6
Dislikes attending school	0	3
Activities		
Likes Academic Activities	10	7
Likes Social Activities	7	8
Dislikes All School Activities	0	1
Learning Goals		
Expresses Academic Goals	8	6
Expresses Personal Goals	7	1
Expresses No Goals	0	3
Relationship To Peers		
Has Friends	9	7
Feels Isolated	1	2
Relationship To Teachers		
Positive View of Teacher	10	9
Negative View of Teacher	2	1
Perception of Learning Environment		
Supportive Environment	9	6
Unsupportive Environment	2	2
What Students Would Change		
Better Behaved Classmates	6	5
More Student Choice	1	4
Improved Facilities	2	1
Self-improvement	2	0
No Change	2	0

[a] Number of participants responding from Home Base School

[b] Number of participants responding from comparison site schools

Note: Total responses for a category may exceed number of participants in each group when students gave multiple answers within that category.

These responses suggest several areas of interest. Home Base participants expressed universally positive views about coming to school. Student comments included: ***(Lucy)*** *I feel good.* ***(Tanner)*** *I feel ready to get to my work and eat breakfast.* ***(LaKesha)*** *It feels real good.* ***(Elliott)*** *I feel fantastic, because it feels like it's a beautiful morning.* ***(David)*** *I feet great.* ***(Mark)*** *I feel proud.*

On the other hand, 33% of participants at the comparison site schools expressed negative feelings about coming to school. Negative comments from comparison site students included: ***(Rachel)*** *Kind of tired and hungry.* ***(Mackie)*** *It makes me cold because it's cold out in the morning.* ***(Gordon)*** *I don't like to go to school. Not everyday.*

Goal setting was another area of interest among the student responses. Students were considered to have academic goals if they could name academic concepts or areas they were learning or that their teacher wanted them to learn. When asked what they were learning in school or what their teacher wanted them to learn in school, students who had academic goals responded with answers such as: "Math. How to read. Writing. How to spell. She want me to go to a higher grade and get a lot of good report cards." Students were considered to have personal goals if they could identify social or behavioral objectives they were learning (or that their teacher wanted them to learn) in school.

Personal goals included responses such as "Following directions. Get a lot of good [telephone] calls home. Respect the teacher. Not to fight other kids. Being good. " If students could not identify anything they were learning or that the teacher wanted them to learn, or if students identified only social goals like "playing with my friends" and "going to recess," then they were categorized as having no learning goals. Most students in each group were able to identify at least one academic goal held by themselves or by their teacher. However, the participants at the Home Base School were much more likely to also identify personal goals (70%). Only one participant at the comparison sites identified a personal goal. Three participants at the comparison sites did not identify any learning goals.

Most of the participants at all locations reported that they had a positive relationship with their teacher and a supportive learning environment. When asked what changes they would like to see in their school, more than half of all students stated "better behaved classmates." Forty-four percent of students at the comparison site schools identified "more student choice" as a desired change compared to only 10% of the students at the Home Base School.

Summary

Results indicated greater academic achievement among participants at the Home Base School than among participants in the comparison site schools, despite higher absenteeism among the Home Base participants. Parents of participants at the Home Base School expressed a greater sense of satisfaction with their child's learning environment than did parents of participants at the comparison site schools. No differences appeared on the teacher survey between teacher perceptions of highly mobile students' ability to be successful in school or the teachers' perceptions of their own ability to teach such students.

Teachers at the Home Base School used a wider variety of instructional models accompanied by expanded design and use of instructional supports. The use of instructional supports at the Home Base School more frequently included emergent or creative use of materials that had been designed by teachers or students rather than a heavy reliance on commercially prepared materials. Teachers at the Home Base School more often took an active and supportive role in facilitating student learning. Instructional groupings at the Home Base School relied most often on small group instruction, but also reflected a variety of instructional groupings. The comparison site classrooms relied more heavily on whole group instruction, perhaps because the comparison sites used ability grouping of students in many cases.

The quality of teacher responses to students and the disciplinary procedures employed by teachers contribute greatly to the learning environment. Home Base teachers showed overwhelmingly positive responses to students (96% of responses). Comparison site teachers were evenly divided among positive responses (50%) and negative responses (50%). Individually, however, teachers were observed to exhibit one type of response most of the time. That is, teachers who responded negatively to students were observed to do so most of the time, while teachers who responded positively to students were observed to do so most of the time. Teacher interactions with participants in the study reflected approximately the same positive/negative ratio as teacher responses to their students in general.

Participants at the Home Base School demonstrated a stronger sense of school affiliation, higher perceptions of their academic efficacy, greater freedom of movement and student choice, and more positive interactions with their teachers and their peers than did participants at the comparison site schools. These desirable behaviors appear to be influenced by the more positive learning environment created at the Home Base School.

CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences among highly mobile students at the Home Base School and highly mobile students attending their regularly zoned elementary schools when compared by: (a) academic achievement; (b) attendance; (c) discipline referrals; (d) academic efficacy beliefs, and (e) affiliation with their teachers and peers. The study also compared teachers at the Home Base School with teachers in two area elementary schools by (a) instructional behaviors and (b) efficacy beliefs about their ability to successfully teach these at-risk students. Finally, the study compared parents of students at the Home Base School with parents of students in comparison site elementary schools on their satisfaction with the learning environment at their child's school.

In examining the results of this study, one must remember that the Home Base School is totally comprised of students who are deemed to be at risk of school failure because of high mobility. Teachers at the Home Base School have been recruited to teach this population. However, teachers in the comparison site elementary schools have a more heterogeneous population. The only participants from the comparison sites involved in this study were highly mobile children in these classrooms.

Findings

Student Achievement

The participants at the Home Base School made significantly greater gains in reading over the course of the school year than did participants at the comparison sites. The differences in mathematical gains for the year were not statistically significant. All sites used a scripted curriculum for reading and mathematics that relied heavily on direct instruction as a teaching model. Since the prior academic achievement, as measured by ITBS reading and mathematics scores for the 1996-97 school year, were not statistically different between the two groups of students, one may assume that some qualitative differences between the Home Base School and the comparison sites helped to account for this improvement in reading.

Attendance

Students at the Home Base School had approximately twice as many absences during the school year as students at the comparison sites. This finding contradicts the expected results. Despite their more frequent absences, however, the Home Base students surpassed highly mobile students in the comparison sites in reading achievement for the year.

Discipline Referrals

Students at the Home Base School had no discipline referrals for the school year. The teachers at Home Base made a commitment to handle their own disciplinary issues with students. Students were never "written up" and sent to the principal. Only rarely was "time out" used to remove a student from the instruction in the classroom. Also, teachers at the Home Base School used more positive discipline than did teachers at the comparison sites. The teachers at Home Base knew they were dealing with a population of students whose emotional lives were often fragile and unstable. They were much more likely to take a troubled child who was acting out aside and rock the child in a rocking chair for a few minutes than to isolate the student or write a discipline referral. At the comparison sites, discipline was frequently handled by an administrator. Teachers used "time out" and verbal reprimands frequently and often sent students to the principal or the Behavioral Resource teacher for disciplinary purposes. Teachers seemed much more business-like in their dealings with students. The disparity in teachers' responses to students' emotional needs may account for some of the qualitative differences in the learning environments of the Home Base School versus the comparison site schools.

Teachers' Efficacy Beliefs

A researcher-designed survey was administered to teachers participating in the study. Of the 15 teachers observed, 12 returned surveys. The survey measured teachers' perceptions of the ability of highly mobile students to be successful in school and their own ability to successfully teach such students. No significant difference in efficacy beliefs was found among teachers at the Home Base School and the comparison sites. However, some teachers at the comparison sites differed considerably from highly efficacious teachers observed at both Home Base School and in the comparison site schools. There was a distinct disparity between what some teachers reported they believe and their instructional and interpersonal behaviors observed in the classroom.

Student Beliefs of Academic Efficacy

Student perceptions of their own academic efficacy was measured through a survey and also through observation. Student survey results indicated that students at the Home Base School had a higher sense of academic self-efficacy than did the highly mobile students at the comparison sites. Observational data also supported that students at the Home Base School exhibited behaviors indicative of high academic efficacy 65% of the time compared to participants at the comparison sites who exhibited behaviors indicative of high academic efficacy 56% of the time. The differences in supportive learning environment, teacher responses to students, teacher interactions with the participants, and the quality of disciplinary action within the classroom may have some bearing on the students' perceptions of their own academic efficacy.

Parent Perception of Learning Environment

Families who feel empowered by the school are more likely to support school norms for behavior and achievement and thus enhance their children's chances of school success (Flake, 1990). Parents of students at the Home Base School rated the school higher on two measures of satisfaction. They felt more welcome in their child's school, and they felt they had been asked for and given more input into their child's learning environment than did parents of students at the comparison sites. The reason for this difference is easily apparent in the frequency with which parents were included in school activities at Home Base. During the seven months of observations at the Home Base School, the researcher noted two parent visits to a classroom, two programs put on by children during school to which parents and community members were invited, a classroom dinner for mothers on Valentine's Day, a Family Day held by the school, and a field trip which parents were invited to join. The researcher also observed several parents attending conferences with the school director. Home Base has a Home Liaison aide whose job it is to keep in contact with parents through telephone calls and home visits. In addition, the school maintains a "store" of donated clothing and household items where parents and children may come and select things they need--a warm jacket, a pair of shoes, baby clothes--at no charge.

No parents of participants in the study were observed in the comparison site schools. This is an important distinction, for there were many parent and community volunteers in the comparison site schools, but these volunteers were not the parents of the at-risk, highly mobile students involved in this study. The Home Base School made an effort to reach out to parents who might feel unwelcome in traditional school settings.

Instructional Strategies

As predicted, teachers at the Home Base School employed a wider range of instructional strategies and teaching models than did teachers at the comparison sites. This finding may be the best explanation of increased academic achievement by the Home Base School participants. Research by Joyce and others (Joyce & Calhoun, 1996; Joyce & Weil, 1996) has found that the use of powerful teaching models increased student learning and effectively negated the potential risk factors of racial minority, ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status. Traditional instructional strategies which are teacher-dominated and textbook-based are not as successful with at-risk students as strategies which allow students to experience and explore the learning (Knight & Wadsworth, 1994).

At-risk students taught with such experiential strategies have been brought up to national norms in all academic areas, illustrating the power of innovative teaching models to ameliorate educational disadvantage (Maheady, Mallette, & Harper, 1991).

The different instructional models employed by teachers was totaled for each group, and the mean score was reported. On the average, the Home Base School teachers used six different models per teacher, whereas comparison site teachers, on the average, used two different models. Of course, there were extremes at either end--teachers who employed many more than the mean and those who employed far fewer. The teachers who used several models tended to vary instructional strategies frequently. Other teachers rarely deviated from a single model of instruction. In addition, teachers at the Home Base School used models from each of the four families of instructional strategies, thus appealing to a wider number of situations and reaching a greater number of students. Both groups of teachers relied heavily on the behavioral and information-processing families, which could be expected given the similarities in their curricula.

Teachers' Instructional Activities and Roles

Teachers' use of teaching models help to determine what the teacher's and students' role in the classroom will be. Teachers at the Home Base School spent more time involved in the kind of instructional activities and roles that led to an engaging learning climate. Kohn (1995) distinguished between a "working with" learning environment where teachers and students work together as a learning community and a "doing to" environment where teachers focus on student compliance, punishments, and rewards. The Home Base School exhibited a "working with" environment in that teachers at the Home Base School spent almost twice as much time as the teachers at the comparison site schools in demonstrating and modeling skills to be learned. They also were more likely to include metacognitive strategies as part of their instruction. Teachers at the comparison sites spent more instructional time disciplining students than did teachers at the Home Base School.

Teachers' instructional roles were considered on two parameters: active versus directive, and supportive versus unsupportive. Teachers were considered to take an active instructional role if they were working with students. This included behaviors such as modeling, demonstrating, coaching, or questioning. Teacher roles were considered to be directive if the teacher merely told the students what to do without any other participation in the instructional activity.

Instructional roles were considered to be supportive when teachers provided the organization and structure for students to confidently undertake the assignment. This included behaviors such as encouraging students, being readily available for assistance, providing a calm, orderly environment in which to work, providing sufficient time for students to reasonably complete the assignment, and keeping the task clearly focused. Unsupportive roles included behaviors such as critical or punitive comments, distracting the students with other topics, not allowing enough time to reasonably finish the assignment, or failure to provide a quiet, calm atmosphere in which to work. Some teachers also withdrew from students once the assignment had been made and worked on administrative tasks that led them to effectively ignore students.

Home Base teachers took active instructional roles 65% of the time, compared with active roles taken by comparison site teachers only 30% of the time. Comparison site teachers were much more likely to take a directive role (70%) than were Home Base teachers (35%). The Home Base teachers were overwhelmingly supportive in their instructional roles (96% of the time) Comparison site teachers were also supportive most of the time (63%), but they had many more unsupportive roles (37%) than did Home Base teachers (4%). Many of these unsupportive roles in both groups were the result of behaviors exhibited by pre-service teaching interns and substitute teachers.

Perhaps these differences in roles can be attributed to the differences in heterogeneity within the two groups. At the Home Base School, the entire student body is a highly mobile, at-risk group. At the comparison sites, highly mobile, at-risk students were in the minority within each class. Among at least five of the nine comparison site students observed, the participant appeared to be the worst behaved, least attentive student in class. These students differed markedly from their classmates who in many cases appeared to be more cooperative, attentive, and enthusiastic than the participant. Perhaps teachers need more preparation to meet the needs of a diverse group of students.

Instructional Supports and Instructional Grouping

All of the schools involved in the study used a scripted curriculum for both mathematics and reading which relied heavily on commercial materials and direct instruction. One aspect of the study examined what kind of instructional supports teachers used and how these supports were used. Instructional supports were classified as (a) pre-planned or commercially prepared; (b) teacher-designed; or (c) student-designed. These supports could be used in either a prescribed manner or in an emergent and creative manner. In prescribed uses, the instructional supports were employed without any allowance of students' personal interests or insights. Correct responses were uniform. Emergent and creative materials allowed the student to interact with the instructional support so as to create a unique and individual response.

Teachers at the Home Base School used pre-planned instructional supports 46% of the time. Teacher-designed materials were used 40% of the time, and student-designed materials were used 14% of the time. Teachers at the comparison sites used pre-planned materials 62% of the time and used teacher-designed materials 29% of the time. Student-designed materials only constituted 9% of the instructional supports used. Teachers at the Home Base School also had a good balance between the prescribed use (54%) and the emergent use (46%) of instructional supports. At the comparison sites, teachers relied heavily on the prescribed use of materials (81%) with a much smaller usage devoted to creative or emergent use of materials (19%).

Differences emerged between the two groups in terms of the instructional organization and leadership for learning. Instructional groups were classified as (a) combined groups (more than one class working together); (b) whole group; (c) small group, or (d) individual work. Groups were coded by organization and also by leadership. Group leadership was done by (a) the teacher; (b) an aide; (c) an intern or pre-intern; or (d) a substitute teacher. Teachers at the Home Base School used a variety of groupings, with small group work being the most predominate. Teachers at the comparison site schools relied primarily on whole group instruction. Groups in all locations were most often led by a teacher; however, the incidence of teacher-led groups was much higher at Home Base School (91%) compared with teacher-led groups at the comparison site schools (70%). Only 2% of the instructional groups at the Home Base School were led by an intern and no daily substitute teachers were observed. At the comparison site schools, 19% of instructional groups were led by interns and pre-interns, while 9% of the instructional groups were led by substitute teachers. Given the weak performances of interns and substitute teachers which was observed during this study and was reported in detail in Chapter 4, this difference may be educationally significant.

Teacher Responses to Students

The manner in which teachers interact with their students helps to determine the emotional climate of the classroom. Arhar (1992) claims that the relationships between student and teachers and student and peers determine the level of "bonding" a child feels for his or her school. When students feel bonded or affiliated to their school, they are more likely to embrace the standards of behavior and academic achievement set by the school.

Teacher responses to students were taken from the observational data. Each teacher-student interaction that occurred in the classroom was considered, because all of these interactions are important in determining the learning environment. Of the many ways in which teachers could respond to students, the behaviors were coded and progressively condensed until reaching three parameters. Teacher responses were coded as being (a) praising and encouraging or punitive and critical; (b) friendly and accepting or unfriendly and ridiculing; and (c) calm and patient or tense and hostile. Teacher communications that were praising, encouraging, friendly, accepting, calm, and patient were combined and classified as positive responses. Communications that were punitive, critical, unfriendly, ridiculing, tense, or hostile were considered to be negative responses.

Teachers at the Home Base School had overwhelmingly positive responses for their students (96%). The teachers at the comparison sites were evenly divided between positive (50%) and negative (50%) responses to students. However, it must be noted that each teacher had an individual preference for types of responses. In cases where a teacher responded positively to students, she did so most of the time. The same held true for teachers who responded negatively to students. It is also important to note that two-thirds of the negative communication at the Home Base School came from an intern. At the comparison sites, 30% (N= 52/172) of the negative communication to students came from interns or substitute teachers. The higher number of instructional groups led by interns and substitute teachers at the comparison sites certainly contributes to the negative communication students receive.

Teacher Disciplinary Actions

Teachers were judged to have exercised effective or ineffective disciplinary practices within the classroom. Effective disciplinary practices contribute to a collaborative learning environment and seek to make students responsible for their own behavior. Ineffective disciplinary practices are coercive and, though they may result in temporary compliance, often breed resentment and hostility among students (Kohn, 1995).

For purposes of this study, effective disciplinary practices included practices such as maintaining consistent standards for behavior and treating students in a polite and respectful manner. Effective practices also included giving explicit directions for desired behaviors, explaining the rationale behind the rules, asking students to evaluate their own behaviors, and allowing students participate in making classroom rules.

Ineffective disciplinary practices included ambiguous or inconsistent application of the rules. Teachers were considered to set poor behavioral examples when they yelled at students, spoke to them in a hostile or unfriendly manner, or used sarcasm and ridicule to embarrass students. Other examples of negative disciplinary procedures included ignoring student misbehavior, correcting misbehavior ineffectively by making threats or giving commands and not enforcing them, depriving a student of instruction or lowering grades as a means of discipline, or allowing disciplinary action to supplant or subvert classroom instruction.

Teachers at the Home Base School employed effective disciplinary techniques in 93% of their dealings with students. Teachers at the comparison sites also portrayed a majority of effective disciplinary techniques (60%) but the percentage of ineffective disciplinary procedures was much higher (40%) than at the Home Base School.

Teacher Interaction with Participants

Teachers' interactions with participants in the study was coded along several parameters. First, a teacher's response to the participant could be acknowledging or unacknowledging. If the teacher responded to the student either positively or negatively, the response was coded as acknowledging. If the teacher ignored the participant, the response was coded as unacknowledging. The second parameter rated responses as supportive or unsupportive. If the teacher acknowledged the student in a friendly, affirming, and positive manner, that response was considered to be supportive. If the teacher acknowledged the student in a punitive, hostile, or critical manner, that response was coded as unsupportive. Finally, some responses were coded as nurturing because they exhibited a positive personal response to students who had emotional or physical needs. Teacher responses that were acknowledging, supportive, or nurturing were considered to be positive responses. Negative interactions were those which were unacknowledging or unsupportive. Each exchange between the teacher and the participant was noted in the observations and coded during content analysis.

The teachers at the Home Base School exhibited positive interactions with the participants 92% of the time. The teachers at the comparison sites exhibited positive interactions with students under observation 60% of the time. These figures are almost identical to the rates of positive and negative responses of teachers to the entire class.

Participant Interaction with Teachers

Students show their affiliation with the school by being respectful and obedient to their teachers and by pursuing the academic goals of the school (Arhar, 1992). Students' interactions with their teachers were condensed into two major categories: (a) seeking positive attention from their teachers; or (b) seeking negative attention from their teachers. Students were considered to be seeking positive teacher attention when they obeyed instructions, listened politely, responded when appropriate, showed friendliness to the teacher and behaved in helpful and cooperative ways. Students sought negative

---

teacher attention by being disobedient, ignoring teacher instructions or requests, and behaving in uncooperative or unfriendly ways.

Every interaction between the participant and the teacher was coded based on the data recorded during classroom observations. Participants at the Home Base School responded to their teachers in a positive manner most of the time (74%). In contrast, participants at the comparison sites responded negatively to their teachers most of the time (65%).

Participant Interaction with Peers

The interactions between the student under observation and his or her peers was recorded, analyzed, and coded along two parameters. Student interactions were coded as (a) part of a group or isolated from the group; and (b) friendly and helpful to others or aggressive/obstructive to others. Positive peer interaction was considered as being part of a group and/or behaving in a friendly, helpful way. Negative peer interaction was considered as being isolated and/or behaving in an aggressive/obstructive way.

Participants in both the Home Base School and the comparison site schools had more negative peer interactions than they did positive interactions. However, the Home Base participants had fewer negative interactions (59%) with their peers than did participants at the comparison sites who interacted negatively with peers 70% of the time. The preponderance of negative interactions among the participants and their peers should be a cause for concern.

Participant Affiliation with School

Student school affiliation was judged based on behaviors observed during over the course of the study and on student responses to an interview. Observed behaviors which indicated strong affiliation included (a) supporting classroom rules; (b) participating in activities; (c) interacting positively with peers, and seeking out the teacher. These behaviors suggested that the students had a sense of belonging and purpose at school. Behaviors which indicated weak school affiliation included (a) rejecting classroom rules; (b) lack of participation in learning activities; (c) little interaction or negative interaction with peers; and (d) avoiding or ignoring the teacher. Students who exhibited these kinds of behaviors may be already beginning to disengage themselves emotionally and intellectually from the school environment.

Participants at the Home Base School exhibited a strong sense of school affiliation in 80% of their observed behaviors. Participants at the comparison sites exhibited strong affiliation behaviors only 42% of the time.

In addition, on the student interviews, participants at the Home Base School felt more positive about coming to school (100%) than did participants at the comparison sites (70%). Home Base students more frequently articulated academic goals (80%) and personal goals (70%) for their learning experiences. Sixty-six percent of the comparison site participants identified academic goals, but only one student (11%) expressed any personal goals for learning. In addition, three comparison site participants (33%) were not able to identify any learning goals at all. Home Base students were more likely to perceive their classrooms as having supportive learning environments (90%) in contrast to comparison site participants (66%). Comparison site participants felt a greater need to have more student choice in their environment (44%) compared to Home Base students (10%).

Student Instructional Activities and Roles

The behaviors and roles of students during instruction was observed and coded. The wide variety of student activities were condensed into two parameters: (a) attentive to teacher/inattentive to teacher; and (b) engaged with the lesson/unengaged with the lesson. Students who were attentive to the teacher and/or engaged with their work were considered to display productive instructional activities. Students who were inattentive to the teacher and/or unengaged with their work were deemed to exhibit unproductive instructional activities. It is interesting to note that participants in both groups exhibited unproductive instructional behaviors most of the time (Home Base, 53%; Comparison Site, 76%). However, Home Base students spent almost twice as much time engaged in productive instructional activities (47%) as did participants at the comparison sites (24%).

Student instructional roles were rated along two parameters: (a) self-directed or other-directed; and (b) having freedom of movement or having restricted movement. Student roles were considered to be self-directed if students were actively involved in their learning or had choices about their learning tasks. Other-directed roles were exemplified by students being told exactly what to do and how to do it. Some students had considerable flexibility in moving about the classroom. They were able to get out of their seats as needed without permission as long as they finished their work and did not disturb others. These students were deemed to have freedom of movement. Other students had very limited movement. In such classrooms, students were not allowed out of their seats without permission. Several of the teachers required the students to use an elaborate set of hand signals to indicate what they wanted permission to do--for example, raise one finger to sharpen a pencil, two fingers to go to the restroom, three fingers for water, etc. These students were considered to have restricted movement.

Student roles at the Home Base School were approximately evenly divided between self-directed and other-directed, indicating that these students had a significant amount of choice in some of their activities. Students at the comparison sites were much more likely to be other-directed (86% of the time) and had much less choice (14% of the time). In addition, the students at the Home Base School also had an approximately equal division between roles involving freedom of movement (46%) and roles requiring restricted movement (56%). At the comparison site, virtually every lesson and every classroom observed required students to restrict their movement. The learning environment at the comparison sites was much more regimented and business-like than the learning environment at the Home Base School which allowed students more opportunity for exploration and discovery.

Since the teachers at Home Base took a more active and supportive instructional role, students found it much more difficult to engage in unproductive instructional activities than did participants at the comparison sites. In addition, the range of instructional models, a greater use of teacher- and student-designed instructional materials, and more creative, emergent use of instructional supports resulted in Home Base students being more engaged and involved with their own learning. Greater opportunities for student choice and more freedom of movement to explore and discover help to create a "working with" learning environment at the Home Base School.

Conclusions

The results of this study suggest that providing school stability and a supportive learning environment which includes the use of a wide variety of teaching models may counteract some of the negative impact of mobility on academic achievement and school adjustment for this population of at-risk students. At both the Home Base School and the comparison site schools, excellent teaching methods were observed. However, as a group, the teachers at Home Base School appeared to build a more facilitative learning environment for the participants than did those at the comparison site schools. Teachers at Home Base were more positive and supportive in their interactions with students and in their instructional roles, employed a wider variety of teaching models and instructional strategies to facilitate learning, and used more effective disciplinary procedures than did teachers at the comparison sites. Students at the Home Base School exhibited a higher sense of academic self-efficacy, interacted more positively with their teachers, showed a stronger sense of school affiliation, and made greater academic gains in reading than did participants at the comparison sites. In addition, the parents of students at the Home Base School felt more satisfied with their child's learning environment.

Academic achievement can be enhanced in schools that make an effort to create a sense of affiliation among students (Wehlage, Rutter, Smith, Lesko, & Fernandez, 1989;

as cited in Arhar, 1992). Students who have a weak sense of school affiliation are more likely to drift from scholastic purposes and eventually drop out, whereas students who feel a greater sense of school membership are more likely to conform to school norms for behavior and achievement, thus completing school successfully (Arhar, 1992).

The qualitative differences in learning environments between the Home Base School and the comparison sites are apparent. More positive teacher responses to students, effective disciplinary practices, and a supportive learning environment appear to be accompanied by more positive interactions from students to teachers and greater parent satisfaction. The reverse is also suggested: negative teacher responses, ineffective discipline, and less supportive learning environments appear to be accompanied by more negative student interactions with teachers, a lower sense of academic efficacy, a weaker sense of school affiliation, and less parent satisfaction. Although causal predictions cannot be made, the relationship between learning environment, academic achievement, and adjustment to school needs additional exploration.

In a practical sense, it appears that the Home Base School is fulfilling its mission of improving academic achievement and school adjustment for a population of at-risk, highly mobile students. The results of this study indicate that the Home Base School is a pilot project worthy of imitation. The positive learning environment created by the teachers at the Home Base School and the use of powerful teaching models appears to counteract the deleterious effects of higher absenteeism and the risk factors inherent in this population. The qualitative differences which build a "working with" learning environment rather than a "doing to" environment are substantial. The efforts of Home

Base School to include parents seem to add positive values for students as well as enhance parent satisfaction. Many other school districts may find this model helpful in meeting the needs of the locally transient student.

Recommendations

Several areas of concern arise from this study. The use of teaching models should continue to be examined with various populations. While scholars have claimed that these models have the power to counteract risk factors and promote student achievement (Joyce & Calhoun, 1996; Joyce & Weil, 1996), many teachers still rely on very limited repertoires of instructional strategies. Studies must continue to explore the power of various instructional strategies and, if indicated, encourage more teacher training in mastering a variety of teaching models. Students at both the Home Base School and the comparison site schools were observed to spend more than half of their class time engaged in unproductive instructional activities. Teachers and teacher preparation programs need to develop a repertoire of teaching models and instructional strategies that are engaging and motivating to students.

Perhaps teacher pre-service programs should be investigated to determine the extent of preparation that is offered to students in the area of instructional strategies. Also, teachers who are graduates of programs that offer preparation in instructional strategies should be studied in context-specific situations across similar populations and compared to teachers who have had less preparation. Thus, researchers may be able to describe the myriad of ways that varied instructional strategies can be used to facilitate successful outcomes.

Student aggression toward other students is also an area of great concern. In both the Home Base School and in the comparison sites, students often interacted with at least some of their classmates in an unfriendly or aggressive manner. Studies should examine student interactions and how that impacts students' perceptions of learning environment, students' sense of school affiliation, and student-teacher interactions, and identify strategies to promote harmonious interactions.

Student-teacher interactions are also an area for concern. As seen in the comparison site schools, many of the interactions between teachers and students are negative (40% in this case). These unpleasant exchanges are deleterious for both teacher and student morale. How can educators, parents, and students build classrooms which are more caring and nurturing environments for all concerned? What impact does this negative interaction have on students' achievement, efficacy, and affiliation? How do negative teacher-student interactions impact the interactions between students and their peers? If relationships with teachers and peers form a student's bond with the school, how can school administrators and faculty explicitly work to create a greater feeling of school affiliation among students?

Another important area for investigation is the preparation of pre-service interns and substitute teachers. In almost every case observed during this study, the instructional and management behaviors of substitute teachers and interns were quite negative. Interns and substitute teachers accounted for a significant proportion of ineffective disciplinary practices and negative responses to students at both the Home Base School and the comparison sites. Further studies should examine pre-service training for interns, especially in terms of the preparation they receive in personal interactions, positive communication, classroom management, and instructional strategies. The vast majority of interns observed appeared to be inadequately prepared in all of these areas. Also, studies should examine the role of substitute teachers in our schools. In several classrooms, substitute teachers were employed for weeks at a time because of teacher illness or job changes. Based on the observations, one might project that many students lost significant and valuable instructional time due to the substitute's lack of management skills. Perhaps better training and screening procedures for substitute teachers could be devised.

Policy Implications

The results of this study have some policy implications for school district administrators and state legislators. Several issues related to mobility impact a school district. Students who move frequently within a school district are more likely to be at-risk of academic failure than stable students. Student mobility may adversely affect teacher morale and the pace of instruction even for stable students within a classroom. In addition, mobility impacts the accountability measures by which schools are evaluated. Schools with high mobility are often testing students who have not benefited from their instructional program, which makes school accountability measures open to question. School district administrators may want to consider establishing centers similar to the Home Base School to meet the needs of their own locally transient population and to alleviate some of the mobility problems in their schools.

Legislators should look carefully at pilot programs such as the Home Base School. If such models continue to show positive results, legislators may wish to support the duplication of such projects in other districts. Additional funding to help districts offset the increased costs of transportation may be necessary to support these projects. In the long run, however, such costs are negligible if schools like Home Base alleviate the increased risk of failure for highly mobile students.

REFERENCES

Adduci, L. (1990). Mobility and student achievement in Orange High School. Research for Better Schools. Philadelphia, PA: (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 374 920).

Alexander, K. L., Entwistle, D. R., & Dauber, S. L. (1996). Children in motion: School transfers and elementary school performance. The Journal of Educational Research, 90, 3-12.

Ames, C. A. (1999). Motivations: What teachers need to know. In A. C. Ornstein & L. S. Behar-Horenstein (Eds), Contemporary Issues in Curriculum, Second Edition (pp. 135-144). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Anderson, R. N., Greene, M. L., & Loewen, P. S. (1988). Relationships among teachers' and students' thinking skills, sense of efficacy, and student achievement. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 34, 148-165.

Arhar, J. M. (1992). Enhancing students' feelings of school membership. Schools in the Middle, 1, (3), 12-16.

Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement. New York: Longman.

Ashton, P. T., Webb, R. B., & Doda, N. (1983). A study of teachers' sense of efficacy. Final report executive summary (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 231 833). University of Florida: Gainesville, FL.

Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. American Psychologist, 44, (9), 1175-1184.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. Educational Psychologist, 28 (2), 117-148.

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Multifaceted impact of self-efficacy beliefs on academic functioning. Child Development, 67, 1206-1222.

Behar-Horenstein, L. S., & Ganet-Sigel, J. (In press). The art and practice of dance/movement therapy. Needham, MA: Pearson Custom Pub.

Benson, G. P., Haycraft, J. L., Steyaert, J. P., & Weigel, D. J. (1979). Mobility in sixth graders as related to achievement, adjustment, and socioeconomic status. Psychology in the Schools, 16, 444-447.

Blane, D. C., Pilling, D., & Fogelman, K. (1985). The use of longitudinal data in a study of children's school mobility and attainment. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 55, 310-313.

Bolinger, K., & Gilman, D. (1997). Student mobility and demographics: Relationship to aptitude and achievement in a three-year middle school study. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 409 273).

Brophy, J., & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (pp. 328-375). New York: Macmillan.

Cleveland Public Schools (1989). Student stability: Some relationships between student stability and other selected variable for 1987-88. Cleveland, OH (ERIC Document Reproductions Service No. ED 331 942).

Dembo, M. H., & Gibson, S. (1985). Teachers' sense of efficacy: An important factor in school improvement. The Elementary School Journal, 86, 173-184.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (1991). Highly mobile students: Educational problems and some possible solutions. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 338 745). Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, DC.

Flake, C. L. (1990). Academic failure, alienation, the threat of extinction: A global perspective on children at risk. Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, 29, (2), 50-60.

Fletcher, S. (1990). The relation of the school environment to teacher efficacy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA. August 12, 1990.

Florida Department of Education. (1993-94). Chapter 1: Successful schools: Pilot project report. Tallahassee, FL.

General Accounting Office. (1994). Elementary school children: Many changes schools frequently, harming their education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 369 526). Report to the Honorable Mary Kaptur, House of Representatives.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 569-582.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967) The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Heywood, J. S., Thomas, M., & White, S. B. (1997). Does classroom mobility hurt stable students? An examination of achievement in urban schools. Urban Education, 32(3), 354-372.

Higgs, G. E. (1995) Rethinking locus of agency in the at-risk condition (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 394-110).

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Bassler, O. C., & Brissie, J. S. (1992). Explorations in parent-school relations. Journal of Educational Research, 85, 287-294.

Ingersoll, G. M., Scamman, J. P., & Eckerling, W. D. (1988). Impact of student mobility on student achievement in an urban setting. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.

Joyce, B. R. (1981). Toward a theory of information processing in teaching: The South Bay study. In B. R. Joyce, C. C. Brown, & L. Peck (Eds.), Flexibility in teaching: An excursion into the nature of teaching and training. (pp. 280-299). New York: Longman.

Joyce, B. R., & Calhoun, E. F. (1996). Creating learning experiences: The role of instructional theory and research. Alexandra, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Joyce, B., Calhoun, E., Carran, N., Simser, J., Rust, D., & Halliburton, C. (1996). The university town program: Exploring governance structures. In Learning experiences in school renewal, B. Joyce & E. Calhoun (Eds.). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse.

Joyce, B., Murphy, C., Showers, B., & Murphy, J. (1989) School renewal as cultural change. Educational Leadership, 47, (3), 70-78.

Joyce, B. R., & Weil, M. (1996). Models of teaching. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Joyce, B. R., Weil, M., & Wald, R. (1981). A structure for pluralism in teacher education. In B. R. Joyce, C. C. Brown, & L. Peck (Eds.), Flexibility in teaching: An excursion into the nature of teaching and training. (pp. 119-140). New York: Longman.

Kerbow, D. (1996). Patterns of urban student mobility and local school reform. (Tech. Report No. 5). Chicago: University of Chicago, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At-Risk.

Knight, D., & Wadsworth, D. (1994). Accommodating the at risk student in the middle school classroom. Middle School Journal, 25, (5), 25-30.

Kohn, A. (1996). What to look for in a classroom. Educational Leadership, 54, (1), 54-55.

Lash, A. A., & Kirkpatrick, S. L. (1990). A classroom perspective on student mobility. The Elementary School Journal, 91, 178-191.

Ligon, G., & Paredes, V. (1992). Student mobility rate: A moving target. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 349 335).

Maheady, L., Mallette, B., & Harper, G. F. (1991). Accommodating cultural, linguistic, and academic diversity: Some peer-mediated instructional options. Preventing School Failure, 36, (1), 28-31.

Mao, M. X., Whitsett, M. D., & Mellor, L. T. (1997). Student mobility, academic performance, and school accountability. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 409 380).

Mehana, M., & Reynolds, A. J. (1995). The effects of school mobility on scholastic achievement. In a paper presented at the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, IN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 385 381).

Mercer, C. D., Jordan, L., Miller, M. D., Schenck, B. J., Black, K., Bock, M., & Kidwell, D. (1996). Curriculum-Based Assessment in Alachua County, Florida: Technical Manual. Exceptional Student Education, School Board of Alachua County.

Midgley, C., Feldlaufer, H., & Eccles, J. S. (1989). Change in teacher efficacy and student self- and task-related beliefs in mathematics during the transition to junior high school. Journal of Educational Psychology, 81, 247-258.

Newman, J. (1988). What should we do about the highly mobile student? Research brief. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 305 545).

Pajares, F. (1996) Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. Review of Educational Research, 66, 543-578.

Paris, S. G., & Byrnes, J. P. (1989). The constructivist approach to self-regulation and learning in the classroom. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theory, research, and practice (pp. 170-200). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Porter, A. C., & Brophy, J. (1988). Synthesis of research on good teaching: Insights from the work of the Institute for Research on Teaching. Educational Leadership, 45, (8),74-85.

Raudenbush, S. W., Rowan, B., & Cheong, Y. F. (1992). Contextual effects on the self-perceived efficacy of high school teachers. Sociology of Education, 65, 150-167.

Reynolds, A. J. (1991). Early schooling of children at risk. American Education Research Journal, 28, 392-422.

Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effects of coaching on student achievement. Canadian Journal of Education, 17, (1), 51-65.

Ross, J. A. (1994). Beliefs that make a difference: The origins and impacts of teacher efficacy. Paper presented at the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, Calgary, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 379 216).

Schunk, D. H. (1981). Modeling and attributional effects of children's achievement: A self-efficacy analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73, 93-105.

Schunk, D. H. (1989). Social cognitive theory and self-regulated learning. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theory, research, and practice (pp. 83-110). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. Educational Psychologist, 26, 207-231.

Schunk, D. H., & Cox, P. D. (1986). Strategy training and attributional feedback with learning disabled students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 78, 201-209.

Sewell, C., Rodriguez, T. Chandler-Goddard, B., & Angelettie-Wallace, N. (1982). The impact of pupil mobility on assessment of achievement and its implications for program planning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 228 322).

Sharan, S., & Shachar, H. (1988). Language and learning in the cooperative classroom. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). Participant observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Straits, B. C. (1987). Residence, migration, and school progress. Sociology of Education, 60, (1), 34-43.

Stronge, J. H. (1993). Educating homeless students in urban settings. Education and Urban Society, 25, 315-322.

Weiner, B. (1976). An attributional approach for educational psychology. Review of Research in Education, 4, 179-209.

Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82, 81-91.

APPENDIX A
Observation Questions

Observation Questions

I. Describe sequentially the tasks that students are asked to do.

A. What is the model of teaching?

II. Describe the student and teacher roles and their respective involvement in the lesson.

A. What are the teacher's instructional activities?
B. What are the student's instructional activities?
C. What are the teacher's instructional roles?
D. What are the student's instructional roles?
E. What is the instructional grouping for the lesson?
F. Who is leading the instructional group?
G. Describe the behaviors that indicate the student's sense of academic efficacy.

III. Describe the teacher's response to students' questions and answers.

A. What are the characteristics of the teacher's responses to students?
B. What are the characteristics of teacher discipline?

IV. Describe how instructional supports are used throughout the lesson.

A. What are the instructional supports for the lesson?
B. What is the source of the instructional supports?
C. Describe how the instructional supports are used in the lesson.

V. Describe the social interaction of students being observed with their peers and with the teacher.

A. Describe the quality of teacher interaction with the student under observation.
B. Describe the quality of interaction between the student under observation and his or her peers
C. Describe the quality of interaction from the student under observation toward the teacher.
D. Describe the student's demonstrated sense of school affiliation.
E. Diagram the placement of the student being observed.

APPENDIX B
Student Survey

Approved by the
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board
(IRB 02) for use through
AUG 07 1998

Student Survey

Verbal instructions: I'd like to ask you some questions about how you think you are doing in school. I'll read the question and I want you to mark the circle that shows how you feel. The bigger the circle, the better you feel you can do on that item.

1. How well can you get teachers to help you when you find schoolwork is too hard to do?

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

don't know not well at all pretty well very well

2. How well can you get another student to help you when you get stuck on schoolwork?

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

don't know not well at all pretty well very well

3. How well can you learn numbers (arithmetic)?

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

don't know not well at all pretty well very well

4. How well can you learn reading skills?

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

don't know not well at all pretty well very well

5. How well can you learn writing skills?

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

don't know not well at all pretty well very well

Approved by the
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board
(IRB 02) for use through
AUG 0 7 1998

6. How well can you pay attention to school subjects?

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

don't know not well at all pretty well very well

7. How well can you remember what you learn in school?

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

don't know not well at all pretty well very well

8. When the teacher asks questions in class, how well do you participate in answering?

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

don't know not well at all pretty well very well

9. How well can you make and keep friends?

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

don't know not well at all pretty well very well

10. How well can you work with other children in a group?

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

don't know not well at all pretty well very well

APPENDIX C
Teacher Survey

Approved by the
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board
(IRB 02) for use through
AUG 0 7 1998

Teacher Survey

Please indicate your opinion by responding to the items below. Encircle the number that best reflects your beliefs about the item. Use the following scale: [5] = a great deal; [4] = quite a bit; [3] = some; [2] = very little; [1] = not at all.

Part A:		not at all	very little	some	quite a bit	a great deal
1.	How much training have you had in working with high-risk students?	1	2	3	4	5
2.	How much training have you had in working with highly mobile students?	1	2	3	4	5
3.	How much do you think the teaching profession values working with highly mobile students?	1	2	3	4	5
4.	How effective are you in working with highly mobile students?	1	2	3	4	5
5.	How effective are you in helping a student who enters your class after the academic year begins adjust to classroom rules?	1	2	3	4	5
6.	How successful are you in bringing a student who enters your class after the academic year begins up to the current instructional level of the class?	1	2	3	4	5
7.	How effective are you in helping a student who enters your class after the academic year begins integrate socially into the classroom?	1	2	3	4	5
8.	How effective are you in finding out important information about a student who enters your class after the academic year begins from his/her academic records?	1	2	3	4	5

Part B: *Please indicate the following by circling the correct response.*

1. How many years of teaching experience do you have? 0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 20+

2. What is the highest degree you hold? BA MA EdS EdD/PhD

APPENDIX D
Student Interview Questions

Approved by the
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board
(IRB 02) for use through
AUG 07 1998

Student Survey

The survey will be administered orally and student answers will be audiotaped. Confidentiality will be protected and consent obtained prior to taping. The tapes will be shared only with the project supervisor and will be destroyed upon completion of the project.

1. How do you feel when you come to school each day?

2. What do you like about school?

3. What are your favorite things to do at school?

4. What are you learning in school?

5. Describe your teacher for me. Tell me about him/her.

6. Tell me about your work in school. What does your teacher want you to learn?

7. What does your teacher tell you about your work in school?

8. Tell me about your friends in school.

9. Is there anything about school that makes you unhappy or that you don't like? If so, what?

10. If you could make something different at school, what would it be?

APPENDIX E
Student Assent Script

Student Assent Script

I will explain the project to students and obtain their assent by using approximately the script below.

Hi. My name is Sandi. I go to school just like you. I'd like to ask you some questions about how you like school and what you do at school. You do not have to answer any question you do not wish to answer and you may stop whenever you wish. There aren't any right or wrong answers, and you won't get a grade for what you say. I'd just like you to just tell me how you feel. Would you be willing to answer questions about school for me?

Approved by the
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board
(IRB 02) for use through
AUG 07 1998

APPENDIX F
Institutional Review Board Approval

UNIVERSITY OF
FLORIDA

Institutional Review Board

98A Psychology Bldg.
PO Box 112250
Gainesville, FL 32611-2250
(352) 392-0433
Fax (352) 392-0433

August 8, 1997

TO: Ms. Sandra H. Anusavice
1000 NW 112 Terrace
Gainesville, FL 32606

FROM: C. Michael Levy, Chair
University of Florida Institutional
Review Board

SUBJECT: Approval of Project #97.448
Effectiveness of specialized placement for highly mobile at-risk students

Funding: Unfunded

I am pleased to advise you that the University of Florida Institutional Review Board has recommended the approval of this project. The Board concluded that participants will not be placed at more than minimal risk in this research. Given your protocol, it is essential that you obtain signed documentation of consent from each participant over 18 years of age, and from the parent or legal guardian of each participant under 18 years of age. When it is feasible, you should obtain signatures from both parents. Enclosed are the dated, IRB-approved informed consents to be used when recruiting participants for this research.

If you wish to make any changes in this protocol, you must disclose your plans before you implement them so that the Board can assess their impact on your project. In addition, you must report to the Board any unexpected complications arising from the project which affect your participants.

If you have not completed this project by August 7, 1998, please telephone our office (392-0433) and we will tell you how to obtain a renewal.

It is important that you keep your Department Chair informed about the status of this research.

CML/h2

cc: Vice President for Research
Dr. Linda Behar-Horenstein

Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action Institution

APPENDIX G
Parent Consent Forms

Parental Consent Form (Page 1 of 2 pages)

Dear Parent/Guardian,

I am a graduate student in the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Florida, conducting research on placement of highly mobile students under the supervision of Dr. Linda Behar-Horenstein. The purpose of this study is to compare the academic achievement and student attitudes about school of students in the Anchor Center (a special school for students whose families move frequently) and students of similar backgrounds in a regular elementary school setting. The results of this study may help school districts decide whether or not the Anchor Center program is effective and whether or not the program should be expanded, maintained, or eliminated. These results may not directly help your child today, but may benefit future students.

I am requesting your permission to include your child in an interview where I will ask some questions about how he or she feels about school and his or her school activities. The interview should take about five minutes and will be held during school. I will work with the classroom teacher to arrange an appropriate time for the interview so your child will not miss academic instruction. Participating students will not have to answer any questions they do not wish to answer. These interviews will be audiotaped. I will use this information to help determine the students' attitudes about school. The tapes will be transcribed and will be shared only with my supervisor. The tapes and the transcriptions will be destroyed after the study is completed. The school will administer a pre- and post-test to measure student progress during the year. I am also requesting your permission to obtain test scores for your child from the school to determine your child's progress. Students will not be identified by name within the study. Their identities will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Results will be reported only as group data. Participation or non-participation in this study will not affect the student's grades or placement in any programs. You and your child have the right to withdraw consent for participation at any time without consequence. There are no known risks or immediate benefits to the participants. No compensation is offered for participation. Group results of this study will be available in September of 1998 upon request.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact me at 332-0011 or my faculty supervisor at 392-2391 ext. 269. Questions or concerns about the research participant's rights may be directed to the UFIRB office, University of Florida, Box 112250, Gainesville, FL 32611, (352) 392-0433.

Sincerely,

Sandra H. Anusavice

I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily give my consent for my child,_________ __________________, to participate in Sandi Anusavice's study of Anchor Center placement. I have received a copy of this description.

____________________________ ____________________

Parent/Guardian Date

____________________________ ____________________

2nd Parent/Witness Date

Approved by the
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board
(IRB 02) for use through
AUG 07 1998

Parental Consent Form (Page 2 of 2 pages)

May I contact you to ask you some questions about how you feel the school is helping your child?

_______ Yes, I would be interested in talking about how the school is helping my child.

You may contact me at ______________________ (telephone number). The best time of day to reach me is__________________________(a.m./p.m.)

_______ No, I am not interested in being contacted.

Approved by the
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board
(IRB 02) for use through
AUG 07 1998

Parent Survey Consent Form

Dear Parent/Guardian,

I am a graduate student in the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Florida, conducting research on placement of highly mobile students under the supervision of Dr. Linda Behar-Horenstein. The purpose of this study is to compare the academic achievement and student attitudes about school of students in the Anchor Center (a special school for students whose families move frequently) and students of similar backgrounds in a regular elementary school setting. The results of this study may help school districts decide whether or not the Anchor Center program is effective and whether or not the program should be expanded, maintained, or eliminated. These results may not directly help your child today, but may benefit future students.

I am requesting your participation in a survey to answer some questions about how the school is serving your child. The survey will take a few minutes of your time to complete and return to me. You do not need to answer any question if you do not wish to do so. The results of the survey will be compiled and reported in my research project as group data. Neither students nor parents will be identified by name within the study. Identities will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Results will be reported only as group data. Participation or non-participation in this study will not affect the student's grades or placement in any programs. You have the right to withdraw consent for your participation any time without consequence. There are no known risks or immediate benefits to the participants. No compensation is offered for participation. Group results of this study will be available in September of 1998 upon request.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact me at 332-0011 or my faculty supervisor at 392-2391 ext. 269. Questions or concerns about the research participant's rights may be directed to the UFIRB office, University of Florida, Box 112250, Gainesville, FL 32611; (352) 392-0433.

Please sign below to indicate whether or not you are willing to participate in the survey. Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely,

Sandi Anusavice

****

_____ Yes, I am willing to answer some questions about how the school is meeting my child's needs.

_____ No, I am not willing to participate in the survey.

______________________________ Parent Signature

__________ Date

**Approved by the
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board
(IRB 02) for use through**

AUG 07 1998

APPENDIX H
Teacher Consent Form

Teacher Consent Form

Dear Teacher,

I am a graduate student in the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Florida, conducting research on placement of highly mobile students under the supervision of Dr. Linda Behar-Horenstein. The purpose of this study is to compare the academic achievement and student attitudes about school of students in the Anchor Center (a special school for students whose families move frequently) and students of similar backgrounds in a regular elementary school setting. The results of this study may help school districts decide whether or not the Anchor Center program is effective and whether or not the program should be expanded, maintained, or eliminated. These results may not directly help your child today, but may benefit future students.

I am requesting your participation in a survey that will ask questions about your work with at-risk children. The written survey will take approximately five minutes of your time to complete. Teachers will not be identified by name within the study. Your identities will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Results will be reported only as group data. You have the right to withdraw consent for participation at any time without consequence. There are no known risks or immediate benefits to the participants. No compensation is offered for participation. Group results of this study will be available in September of 1998 upon request.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact me at 332-0011 or my faculty supervisor at 392-2391 ext. 269. Questions or concerns about the research participant's rights may be directed to the UFIRB office, University of Florida, Box 112250, Gainesville, FL 32611; (352) 392-0433.

Sincerely,

Sandra H. Anusavice

****

_____ Yes, I am willing to participate in Sandra Anusavice's survey to discuss my feelings about working with at-risk students.

_____ No, I am not willing to participate in this survey.

______________________________ Teacher Signature

______________ Date

Approved by the
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board
(IRB 02) for use through
AUG 07 1998

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Sandra Hatch Anusavice was born in Birmingham, Alabama, and grew up in Florida. She received her bachelor's degree in English Education from the University of Florida in 1970 and completed her master's degree in English Education in 1985. She currently resides in Florida with her husband, Dr. Ken Anusavice. They have two children, Jennifer Leigh (Jill) and Joel Scott.

Sandra has taught middle and high school English for twenty-four years. She has also worked as a career counselor, real estate salesperson, and antique collector. A long-standing interest in students who find school to be a difficult environment eventually led her to pursue a Ph.D. in Educational Leadership with a focus on curriculum and instruction.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Linda S. Behar-Horenstein

Linda S. Behar-Horenstein, Chair
Associate Professor of Educational
Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

James Doud

James Doud
Professor of Educational Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Jin Wen Hsu

Jin-Wen Hsu
Assistant Professor of Foundations of
Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Robert Wright

Robert Wright
Associate Professor of Instruction and
Curriculum

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the College of Education and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August 1999

Gerardo M Gonzalez

Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School

LD
1780
1999
.A634

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
3 1262 08555 1454